

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Paul E. Ayer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Laura M. Keyes and Silas E. Buckland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of colored citizens of Boston, Mass., against the President's order discharging Companies B, C, and D of the Twenty-fifth Infantry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Thorofare Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Lewisburg Council, No. 926, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of E. Wetzmann & Co., against legislation in the copyright law against mechanical instrument music—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of A. W. McGeachin and 44 others, for a service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis Rockwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Hugh H. Brown, James S. Beard, and James W. Stanley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the Veteran's Association of the First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American war, for reestablishment of the canteen in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., for forest reservations in the White and Southern Appalachian mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Swan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: Petitions of Fairmount Council, No. 63; Franklin Council, No. 150; Relief Council, No. 36; New Windsor Council, No. 44; Guiding Star Council, No. 9; Independence Council, No. 98; Mechanicsville Council, No. 78; Alesia Hall Council; Multiply Council, No. 4; Mount Royal Council, No. 61, and Mason and Dixon Line Council, No. 141, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of American Council, No. 60; Wabash Council, No. 73; Riverside Council, No. 105; Ellsworth Council, No. 158, and Baltimore Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Liberty Council, No. 6, Daughters of Liberty, of Baltimore, Md.; Eutaw Council, No. 77, and Friendship Council, No. 7, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Defender Council, No. 6, Daughters of America, of Baltimore, Md.; Monumental Council, No. 13, Daughters of Liberty, of Baltimore, Md., and Maryland Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of M. H. Plunkett—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of West Virginia, for an appropriation to improve the Little Kanawha River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ZENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John D. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 13, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

HIGHWAYS IN CHICKASAW AND CHOCTAW NATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a memorial of the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, approved by the governor of that nation September 20, 1906, relative to the establishment of public highways or roads in the Chickasaw and Choctaw nations; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ARLINGTON (VA.) NATIONAL CEMETERY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, recommending that section 4875 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to provide a compensation of \$100 per month, with fuel and quarters, for the Superintendent of the Arlington (Va.) National Cemetery; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANIC ARTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, made in the States and Territories under the provisions of an act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of schools for the benefit of the agricultural and mechanic arts, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

EXPERIMENTS WITH CHOLERA VIRUS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 12th instant, facts pertaining to experiments with cholera virus alleged to have been made at Manila upon prisoners by Surg. Richard P. Strong, United States Army, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 20, 1906, they stand adjourned until Thursday, January 3, 1907; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolution just received from the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 20, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, January 3, 1907.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the resolution of the House be sent to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented the memorial of Frank C. Storck, of Red Bank, N. J., and the memorial of D. Wolff & Co., of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the adoption of a certain amendment to the copyright bill relating to musical instruments; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of Thorofare Grange, No. 59, Patrons of Husbandry, of Thorofare, N. J., and a memorial of Upper Township Grange, No. 139, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tuckahoe, N. J., remonstrating against any further appropriation being made for the free distribution of seeds and plants; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of F. C. Colton, of New York City, N. Y., praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the New York branch of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, praying that reciprocal trade relations with Germany be established, especially relative to the fruit industry; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the board of managers of the New York Produce Exchange, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the free distribution of seeds; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the First Regiment, Spanish War Veterans, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the reestablishment of the Army canteen; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of the Chamber of Com-

merce, Board of Trade, and the Business Men's Association of Norfolk, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the salaries of post-office clerks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Banker's Club of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a bank-note currency to meet the requirements of the business of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the South Washington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the discontinuance of grade crossings; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Buckland, Mass., and a memorial of sundry citizens of South Amherst, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newark, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOR, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the faculty of Columbia College, of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to include college publications in second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Red Bank, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of salaries of clerks in post-offices of the first and second class; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the New Jersey Bankers' Association, of Jersey City, N. J., and a petition of the Second National Bank of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called "railroad rate bill" relative to bills of lading; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BULKELEY presented a memorial of Rippowan Grange, No. 145, Patrons of Husbandry, of Long Ridge, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the distribution of free seeds; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American war, of New Britain, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to repeal the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the memorial of W. N. C. Carlton, librarian of Trinity College Library, Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS AT SEA.

Mr. FRYE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 6855) to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea."

I was instructed by the Committee on Commerce to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. It is very important that it shall become a law at the present session. The International Maritime Congress several years ago met to consider rules and regulations to prevent collisions at sea. All the maritime nations agreed upon certain rules and regulations, and the United States adopted those rules and regulations by law, as it was obliged to do.

The fishing interests were not considered at that time, but since then they have been pursuing the inquiry as to what rules and regulations were required for fishing craft, and all the maritime nations have finally agreed upon rules and regulations touching fishing vessels. Therefore it becomes necessary that we shall unite with them, and the only way we can do it is by enacting into law those rules and regulations.

I will say in relation to the fishermen that circulars were sent to nearly if not quite all who are interested in fishing vessels, and nine replies out of ten were in favor of the rules and regulations as agreed to by the Maritime Congress. The only objection raised by anyone to them was the additional cost to the fishermen. That is a mere bagatelle, and it ought not to be considered in the matter of collisions.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection,

the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6754) granting to the Siletz Power and Manufacturing Company a right of way for a water ditch or canal through the Siletz Indian Reservation, in Oregon, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4554) to remove the charge of absence without leave and reported desertion from the military record of J. F. Wisniewski, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CRANE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6729) authorizing the President to appoint Webb C. Maglathlin a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 7139) granting an honorable discharge to Leonard Thielman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7140) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Dunn;

A bill (S. 7141) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Guptill; and

A bill (S. 7142) granting an increase of pension to Selden Dawes.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 7143) directing the Postmaster-General to credit John A. Bingham, late postmaster at Vandalia, Ill., in the sum of \$500, on account of stamps lost by burglary; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their respective titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7144) granting an increase of pension to Joel Brown; and

A bill (S. 7145) granting a pension to Louise H. Curtis.

Mr. PLATT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (S. 7146) to provide for the compensation of the appraiser of merchandise at the port of New York; and

A bill (S. 7147) to amend section 2536 of the Revised Statutes relative to assistant appraisers at the port of New York, and further defining their powers, duties, and compensation.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 7148) for the relief of Jabez Burchard; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7149) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7150) granting an increase of pension to John Bell;

A bill (S. 7151) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. Reber;

A bill (S. 7152) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Foust;

A bill (S. 7153) granting a pension to Edwin R. Smith; and

A bill (S. 7154) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Miller.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 7155) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Georgetown, State of Delaware; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7156) granting an increase of

pension to John W. Thomas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 7157) granting an increase of pension to Austin S. Dunning; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 7158) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Clarksburg, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7159) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Mannington, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PILES introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7160) granting an increase of pension to Kate Myers; and

A bill (S. 7161) granting an increase of pension to George A. Tyler.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 7162) granting a pension to William H. Sheckler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DICK introduced a bill (S. 7163) to correct the naval record of Alfred Burgess; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7164) to amend the military record of Charles W. Fillmore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 7165) to regulate the width of parking, sidewalks, roadways, and carriageways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LONG (for Mr. DOLLIVER) introduced a bill (S. 7166) to correct the military record of Joseph Maiden; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 7167) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Wooster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 7168) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Shepherd; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 7169) for the relief of the estate of William A. Coffman, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 7170) to amend an act relating to service on foreign corporations, approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,'" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7171) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Holden; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Fish; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7173) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 7174) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Faggart (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 7175) granting an increase of pension to Adline Mabry (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 7176) granting an increase of pension to William J. R. Waters; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 7177) granting an increase of pension to M. L. Le Suer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 7178) granting an increase of pension to Timothy J. Sheehan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEARIN introduced a bill (S. 7179) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge G. Haseltine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 7180) for the purchase of a site for a Federal building for the United States post-office at Hickory, N. C.;

A bill (S. 7181) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Gastonia, N. C.;

A bill (S. 7182) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wilson, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 7183) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lexington, N. C.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7184) granting an increase of pension to Uriah S. Bradley; and

A bill (S. 7185) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Church.

Mr. CARMACK introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 7186) to limit the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts of the United States; and

A bill (S. 7187) to amend the jurisdiction act of 1887 so as to abrogate Federal jurisdiction over State corporations when the jurisdiction is founded only on the fact that the action or suit brought is between citizens of different States.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 7188) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Martin All; and

A bill (S. 7189) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Randolph F. Williamson.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7190) granting a pension to John H. Walden;

A bill (S. 7191) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Jones;

A bill (S. 7192) granting an increase of pension to Noah Jarvis;

A bill (S. 7193) granting an increase of pension to David C. Benjamin;

A bill (S. 7194) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Over;

A bill (S. 7195) granting an increase of pension to William L. Scott;

A bill (S. 7196) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hubbard;

A bill (S. 7197) granting an increase of pension to William H. Horn;

A bill (S. 7198) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Korp;

A bill (S. 7199) granting an increase of pension to John McCool;

A bill (S. 7200) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Graham; and

A bill (S. 7201) granting an increase of pension to James Edwards.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 7202) for the relief of the estate of William Joslin, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 7203) granting a pension to Isaac Sawyer, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 7204) for the purchase of a site for a Federal building for the United States court, custom-house, and post-office at Miami, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 7205) for the relief of the stewards of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Bowling Green, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7206) for the relief of the trustees of the Central University of Kentucky (formerly Center College), of Danville, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7207) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Danville, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7208) for the relief of the deacons of the African Baptist Church, of Richmond, Ky.;

A bill (S. 7209) for the relief of the secretary and treasurer of Harrison Masonic Lodge, No. 122, of Brandenburg, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 7210) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Mount Sterling, Ky.

SENATOR FROM UTAH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there are no concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate resolution No. 143.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution indicated by the Senator from Michigan.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution reported June 11, 1906, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That REED SMOOT is not entitled to a seat as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, it is difficult to describe conditions in Utah and the surrounding country where the Mormons are in great numbers so that one not familiar can form an adequate idea of the situation.

Negro domination in the South would not be tolerated by the white man, and, finally, the entire North has come to sympathize with the white people of the South in their determination that the black race shall not be supreme in political affairs.

The same principle is involved in the contest which the non-Mormons are making against the political control of the Mormon hierarchy. It is almost impossible for one who has not spent some time among the Mormon people, and who has not studied conditions existing in the Mormon country, to appreciate the tremendous power and influence which the leaders of the Mormon Church have over their followers in all things.

The Mormon Church is a commercial and political organization essentially. The followers, for the most part, are simple-minded and industrious people, who are content to live on farms and eke out an existence for themselves and families. Their condition is better than it was before they joined the Mormon Church in Sweden, Denmark, or Wales, or England, or the Southern States, or the backwoods of Indiana or Illinois.

The leaders—and by the leaders I mean especially those who control the people in spiritual, temporal, and political affairs, who are the first presidency and the twelve apostles—are, with rare exception, bright and active men of the world, and Americans by birth. They are business men, and handle the church on business principles. Generally they are well to do, and some of them are rich. They live nicely and mingle with men of the world in high positions on perfectly easy and equal footing.

The church collects a tithe from all its members. Its members are taught constantly that the paying of tithes is a high duty, and that one can not be in good standing in the church unless tithing is paid freely and fully. When a Mormon does not pay his tithing cheerfully he is regarded by the heads of the church as a very poor Mormon.

They pay this tithe, or 10 per cent of all their earnings, either in money or in kind; for instance, if a follower has ten calves, but no money, he gives to the tithe collector one calf. If he has ten tons of hay, he gives one ton of hay; and in a great many instances a Mormon has no money, and so gives in kind, no matter whether it is eggs or butter or cheese or chickens, or what not. The tithe collector turns this property over to the proper officer of the church, and the produce is disposed of and is used for the benefit of the church.

If you take into consideration that in addition to this 10 per cent which every good Mormon must pay to the church he is also called upon to pay his ordinary taxes, as a citizen, amounting to from 3 to 5 per cent, you can easily see that the rank and file of the Mormon people do not make much progress toward material independence.

Tithing at the present time is being freely given, and must amount to something in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000 a year. This tithing is paid to the high officers of the church, and there is never any accounting to anybody for its disposition.

Only recently a Mr. Smurthwait, of Ogden, Utah, a wealthy man, was turned out of the church because he undertook to enter into business in competition with the church. Before being excommunicated, however, he brought suit against the church in the court for an accounting of the tithings, alleging that he himself paid money to the church, and that he had a right to know what became of it. The subservient courts of Utah of course dismissed the suit.

The Mormons are urged to contribute to the building of temples, and apparently enough money has been collected for the building of these temples to have built a great many more than there are.

The leaders of the Mormon Church are engaged in business enterprises of all descriptions. The Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institution is a great business establishment, dealing in all kinds of articles which department stores would carry, and

has many branches. The Mormons trade with the Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institution, and it is almost impossible for a non-Mormon to compete with the Zion Cooperative Mercantile Institution in a community where the Mormons are in the great majority.

The leaders of the church and those high in its councils are the directors and managers and controllers of this high commercial institution. The leaders are also presidents and directors of banks, mining companies, railroad companies, electrical companies, summer and bathing resorts, theaters, etc. In fact, the hierarchy and the church are controlling spirits in all sorts of business enterprises.

They are not made president of the church and apostles because they are successful business men and because they are presidents and directors of these various business organizations, but they become directors and controllers in these organizations by virtue of their being president of the church and apostles, and after they have been selected as president or apostles of the church.

The constant tendency is to make the church and state one, with the church in control. This has been so completely and so ingeniously carried out that it is impossible in any affair, temporal, spiritual, or political, to tell where the authority of the church begins or ends. It is impossible to separate the ecclesiastical power of control from the political power of control.

All authority in temporal, spiritual, and political affairs unites and is centered and is absolute and binding in the hierarchy.

The organization of the church is very complete in its arrangements. The power begins with and ends with the hierarchy. Nearly all members of the church are given some office and some responsibility, and there is an opportunity for advancement in all directions, ecclesiastical, temporal, and political, if the Mormon is obedient to his leaders and accepts without question their counsel. There are but comparatively few lay members of this church. The smallest officers, such as teachers, are selected by the bishops of the various wards. Commencing with the bishops and going up in ecclesiastical authority all the officers of the church are appointed with the approval of the president of the church. In other words, the president selects all officers of the church of responsibility. Commencing at the lowest of the officers of the church and going up to the president himself, you begin with the bishops of wards, who have jurisdiction over geographical subdivisions and locally are the recognized heads of the Mormons in their particular locality. They collect the tithings, settle disputes among the Mormons, look after church and secular affairs of the Mormons in their wards.

Each bishop has two counselors, selected by himself.

Next above the bishops come the presidents of stakes. A stake is a much larger subdivision of territory inhabited by Mormons. The president of a stake has two counselors, also appointed by himself. The president of a stake is the highest authority locally in the Mormon Church, outside of Utah.

Above the president of the stakes are about a dozen other officers, with different designations and different powers, until you come to the twelve apostles, who stand next in authority to the president of the church himself. All of these officers, including the apostles, are appointed directly by the president of the church, without consultation or restraint by anyone, or else, as in the case of bishops, they are approved by the president of the church before their selection can be made valid. In the case of the selection of an apostle to fill a vacancy in the apostolic quorum, the theory is that the apostles themselves fill this vacancy; but it is a fact that the president of the church claims that he received a revelation from God that some certain man shall be selected for this apostleship, and the apostles unhesitatingly accept this revelation and select the man named by the president of the church.

Ecclesiastical preferment in the church means opportunity for temporal advancement. The business, social, and political future of every Mormon depends upon his standing with the church. Every avenue is open to him so long as he implicitly obeys the counsel and does the bidding of the church, while every avenue is closed to him whenever he loses his fellowship in the church. There is nothing left for a Mormon who refuses to obey implicitly whatever policy the church may determine upon except to leave the church entirely and take his chances with the world, the same as non-Mormons do. For a Mormon brought up in the church to sever the ties which bind him to all his kindred and the associations, teachings, and trainings of a lifetime is well-nigh appalling. It means social ostracism. The pretty fiction is given to the Mormon people and the world that all these officers of the Mormon Church, including the president himself, must be selected by the people at the various conferences. This they attempt to prove from the fact that at these conferences the names of the first presidents and the apostles,

the seven presidents of seventies, the presidents of stakes, and the bishops are submitted to the people and they are asked to "sustain" them by holding up their hands. The list includes a great many, of course, and I doubt if a case has ever been known where anyone of the 10,000 people gathered in a semi-annual conference has risen in his place and objected to "sustaining" any officer submitted to the conference by the authorities of the church. I doubt if any provision is made in case such a protest or dissent should come. It never was contemplated that any member of the church would question the divine right of the authorities to select these officers. I imagine that if anyone should have the temerity to object to sustaining an officer presented to the conference for their approval that such a member would have to withdraw his objection or else be disfellowshipped if he persisted in his objection.

You can imagine what complete domination the church has over its followers through this power of the president to appoint all the officers of the church by reflecting on the effect on the appointees their selection by the President of the United States has on them. As a rule, the President selects men to fill the Federal offices who have demonstrated their acceptance of the principles of the party of which the President is the head and who have been zealous in the advocacy of those principles. Whenever a policy for the party is announced by the President of the United States and his close party associates high in authority, these officeholders, as a rule, immediately become advocates of that policy. When you contemplate that these appointees of the president of the Mormon Church are not, as is the case with the President of the United States, confined to one party, but embrace members of all parties, you can have some faint idea of their subserviency.

When you take into account, in addition, that not only political preferment is involved in their acquiescence, but that every opportunity for advancement in all the walks of life are dependent upon their accepting the decrees of their leaders, you can begin to comprehend the tremendous power politically which this hierarchy wields.

The president of the Mormon Church, Joseph F. Smith, and the president of the twelve apostles, who is next in line for the presidency of the church, both testified before the Senate committee that they were living in open polygamy, in defiance of law and of the contract which they made with the Government when they secured statehood for Utah. More than half of the twelve apostles are admittedly defying the law and the Government, in that they are openly living in polygamous relations.

New polygamous marriages are continually being celebrated in the Mormon Church. It has been shown that apostles of the church have entered into or performed these new ceremonies since the manifesto of the church was issued in which the church agreed solemnly to suspend polygamy.

New polygamous marriages are not entered into so openly as in the days before the manifesto, and a different character of men are now entering into the polygamous relation. Formerly the poor and ignorant took plural wives, the same as those better off, and of a higher order of intelligence. Now, young men of ability are selected to enter into these relations. The brainy young men of the church are tied irrevocably to the church and made subservient to it through the polygamous relation. Whenever they contract polygamous marriages, they are without the pale of the law, and their only hope for protection is through this powerful church organization. It is a wonderful fact, and has stood forth plainly throughout all the history of the church, that the polygamists occupy the high ecclesiastical and political positions, and are the wealthiest and most powerful members of the organization in all respects. Under the present system, polygamous marriages are celebrated secretly, and for the most part in foreign countries or beyond the jurisdiction of the United States; for instance, a young man is to take a plural wife, he gets the consent of the authorities through his bishop, goes with his prospective wife to British Columbia, Mexico, or to some place on the ocean some miles beyond the United States coast, where the marriage is celebrated by some authorized officer of the church. Instead, as in the old days when polygamy was entered into indiscriminately, now the polygamists are selected, and in this way the practice is more insidious and dangerous than formerly, because a cult and aristocracy of polygamists are being built up within the church. Those in polygamy are in complete control of the organization now, and have ever been, and it is evident that under the system which they are building up now, they intend to remain always in complete control.

It is much more difficult in these days to prove polygamy or polygamous cohabitation than formerly, because now every means is resorted to to keep the facts concealed that anyone has gone into polygamy. There is no record anywhere of the plural marriages which anyone not a member of the governing body

of the church has access to. It is impossible to prove a polygamous marriage because of the lack of power to prove by the records that a polygamous marriage has been celebrated. When children come as a result of plural marriages the neighbors readily understand that the polygamous relation is being maintained, and if the power were in the State to punish, convictions could be had for unlawful cohabitation. It would be impossible, however, to prove polygamy. In fact, when the Edmunds law was being rigidly enforced, while quite a number of convictions in Utah were secured under the provisions of that act for unlawful cohabitation, no convictions for polygamy could be prosecuted successfully because of the inability on the part of the officers to prove the plural marriage.

A national law, passed by Congress and approved by the President, giving to the United States authorities power to prosecute for polygamy would be ineffective, because there would be no possible way by which a plural marriage could be proved to the satisfaction of a judge or jury.

I desire the Senate to bear that in mind, because at some time in the future when I shall not be here this question will come up. The President of the United States in his message recommends a law for correcting evils connected with marriage and divorce and against polygamy. That is a Mormon suggestion. The leaders of the Mormon Church have asked me to introduce a constitutional amendment to that effect. Such an amendment would not be worth the paper on which it might be written. You can not prove polygamy against these people. If the Government had the power it could provide against plural marriages, but not against Mormons; and every Mormon here stands behind the recommendation of the President of the United States. You can not prove polygamy without proving the second marriage, and you can not prove the second marriage on a Mormon. Such marriages are celebrated in their endowment houses, no one being present except Mormons. The ceremony is performed by the high officials of that organization and no record is kept of it. In their testimony before our committee in regard to their plural marriages they could not even recollect the slightest portion of the ceremony. It is futile to pass laws against polygamy.

While thousands of convictions were secured under the Edmunds law, there were but four or five all told in Utah, Idaho, and elsewhere for polygamy; and in those cases such convictions happened where the polygamous marriage to the second wife, accidentally or through inadvertence, was performed before a recording officer. You can prove unlawful cohabitation, but no Mormon will ever support an amendment to the Constitution providing for the punishment of those living in unlawful cohabitation. You will be confronted with that. The defenders of the Mormons here, including the apostle Senator himself, who is on trial, and all those who are here through the votes and grace of the Mormons, will insist on the polygamous amendment, but they will be very strenuously against an unlawful-cohabitation amendment.

The Supreme Court of the United States has unanimously held that to prove unlawful cohabitation it is only necessary to prove that a man holds out to the world more than one woman as his wife. It is unnecessary even that she bear him children. That can be proved through circumstantial evidence, but you can not prove polygamy through circumstantial evidence.

I may say also, in passing, that unless you provide for the selection of jurors you can not convict; and when you come to the adoption of a constitutional amendment I beg Senators to bear that in mind. You can not, and never could and never did, convict a Mormon of any of these offenses if there was a Mormon on the jury. There is not a Mormon anywhere within the sound of my voice or elsewhere who does not believe, as firmly as any of you believe that which is most dear to you, in the divine right of polygamy; and with a Mormon on the jury you can not convict another Mormon of these offenses. In the early days, under the Edmunds Act, the United States marshal was granted an open venire. He selected his own jurors, and until he did that there never was a conviction of a Mormon for these offenses.

One polygamous marriage entered into now under the system adopted of selecting those who should go into polygamy, with great care, is more dangerous and more inimical, more subversive of law, and more degrading to womanhood than forty such marriages entered into indiscriminately in the past.

It is apparent to all close observers that the church does not intend to give up polygamy. It is plain, on the contrary, that they intend to establish it more firmly, and that they will openly proclaim it again as a divine institution so soon as they think they are in a position to do so.

Their every endeavor is to strengthen their position by extending their political control. They are all powerful in Utah

now, and can control all the political offices, including Senators and Members of Congress. They are so strong in Idaho that no one can be elected to the Senate or House without their consent. This is equally true in Wyoming. They are becoming a large balance of power in Oregon, and when the Government irrigation enterprises are developed in Nevada and large tracts of land are opened there for settlement, they can and easily will colonize and control politics in Nevada.

It is the present condition and the future menace politically that the non-Mormons of this section especially protest against. The non-Mormons in all this region have the same detestation of polygamy that the balance of the country has, and join with the rest of the United States in their desire to protect and exalt womanhood and to enforce obedience and respect for the laws of the land. Those who have not come in contact with the organization, however, do not and can not understand the effect on our free institutions and to our system of government of this tremendous political home of the Mormon hierarchy. It is the chief desire of the non-Mormons in that section to make plain this close union of church and state and to arouse the country, so that through Congressional action it will come to our rescue and help us to break it down.

The lower branch of Congress refused to seat Brigham H. Roberts because he was a self-confessed polygamist. Roberts claimed to be a Democrat. He was a high official, and is now a high official of the Mormon Church, and stands higher in the estimation of that organization than he did before he was deprived of his seat in Congress. His highest allegiance then and his highest allegiance now is to the Mormon Church. Whether he calls himself a Democrat or a Republican is a mere bagatelle, and counts for nothing.

Senator Smoot is not a polygamist, or rather no attempt is made to prove that he is a polygamist. He may be or he may not be. In his case this question does not particularly interest the non-Mormons who live in that section of the country. Senator Smoot is an apostle of the Mormon Church. He is one of the body of twelve, who, next to the first presidency and in conjunction with the first presidency, are the controlling authorities of the church in everything, spiritual, temporal, and political. He would not have been selected as an apostle unless he was in full accord with the authorities of the church.

As I have indicated, obedience to the leaders, obedience to council, subservency to the ruling authorities of the church lead to promotion in the church.

The fact that Senator Smoot was steadily promoted until he was finally selected to be an apostle is proof conclusive that he is in full accord with Joseph F. Smith, Mr. Lyman, and his other brother apostles, who, by their own statements and admissions, are openly living in polygamous relations in defiance of the law. In addition to that, it is not denied, but on the other hand it has been sworn to by the president of the church himself, that REED SMOOT had to secure the consent of the church and of his associate apostles before he could become a candidate for the United States Senate. The president of the church gave his consent that REED SMOOT should be a candidate for the United States Senate. He did not give his consent that any other person should be a candidate for this high office. This consent was given openly and proclaimed to the people of Utah. There was no other candidate for the United States Senate at that election in either party, because it was understood by every man, woman, and child in Utah that, the president of the church and the authorities of the church having given their consent that REED SMOOT should be a candidate, it was the desire and counsel of the church to the Mormons that REED SMOOT should be elected to the United States Senate. No other Mormon dared to announce his candidacy for the United States Senate after the church had selected REED SMOOT. It was useless for any non-Mormon to become a candidate against the candidate of the church. REED SMOOT, therefore, is clearly the Senator of the Mormon hierarchy, and is unmistakably the representative of all the Mormon hierarchy, and is unmistakably the representative of all the Mormon hierarchy stands for, and would do the bidding of the church as its Senator if the directions of the church came in conflict with the duties he has sworn to perform as a Senator of the United States.

I say that notwithstanding the fact that the Senator from Utah testified that if he were confronted with that problem he would go to some other country where he could live his religion, I insist that under the organization of his church he would do the bidding of the church here, and he would not leave the United States and go to any other country, where he could live his religion. He would live it here in the open Senate. If Joseph Smith should receive a revelation from God on any subject, this revelation would be binding on REED SMOOT, no

matter what relation it might bear to the duties which he has sworn to perform under his oath to the United States.

It must be plain to anyone who has followed the testimony of the present case that the Mormon authorities constitute a band of conspirators, whose object is to set aside and nullify the laws of the land when in their judgment such laws are in conflict with the duties which they owe to their organization, and that this conspiracy aims to make the state subservient to the church and to concentrate in the hands of the church authorities the political powers which belong solely to the State. REED SMOOT is a part of this conspiracy as an apostle of the church. He is one of the head conspirators, and not only fully understands the object of the conspiracy, but countenances and encourages by his acquiescence and support the plans and aims of the conspiracy.

Non-Mormons in that section where Mormon influence is predominant believe that the separation of the church and state, the denial of the right of the church to dictate politically, and the breaking down of the church hierarchy in political affairs will have more to do with stopping polygamy than any laws which possibly can be framed or enforced against the practice of polygamy. So long as the political power of the church authorities is maintained and exercised, just so long will every avenue for advancement in all lines to the Mormon people be absolutely under the control of the Mormon authorities. Every incentive compels them, therefore, to accept the conclusion and the counsel of their authorities in every spiritual, temporal, and political matter.

The masses of the Mormon people do not approve of the continuance of polygamy and polygamous living, nor do they approve of the union of church and state and the dictation of the church authorities in political matters. These conditions are no more pleasing to them than to the non-Mormons. Their own individual ambition is stifled, and their independence of action in political and temporal affairs taken away. None would hail with more delight the complete abandonment of polygamy and the political control by the leaders than would the great number of followers of these leaders. Their lives are so interwoven with the teachings and the doctrines of the church, and they are so dependent in their every relation on the church organization, however, that they perforce dread breaking away from it entirely, and rather than do that, with all its attendant consequences, accept present conditions.

If the church authorities would give them absolute freedom of action, and would not, by their example and counsel, teach them obedience in political affairs and defiance of the law in respect to polygamy and polygamous cohabitation, the great masses of the Mormon people would quickly put a stop to polygamy, and would with vigor and energy exercise complete independence in all political matters.

It is my judgment that the masses of the Mormon people intended to live up to the promises made by their leaders to the Government when statehood for Utah was secured. They believed their leaders were sincere in entering into the compact with the Government that polygamy and polygamous relations would cease and that the church would not interfere in politics.

It is the constituted authorities of the organization that the Government has to contend with and not the masses of the people.

So long as polygamy and polygamous relations are openly maintained by the leaders of this organization, and so long as the ruling authorities of the church claim and exercise the right to dominate the State politically, just so long will polygamous relations continue, and just so long will the political power of the church authorities be maintained and strengthened. The followers and the great masses of the people will take the example of their leaders, and will be guided by their counsel in all things.

The hopes of the masses of the people are in the Government, and in them the Government has an ally in so far as their hopes and wishes will aid.

It is only fair, I think, for me to say—and I am glad the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Burrows] treated upon it the other day—that there is a branch of the Mormons, called the "Josephites," who ought to be separated clearly in the minds of all Senators from the Brighamite Mormons. The Josephites claim that they are the custodians of the church as it was founded. They claim that Brigham Young has interjected doctrines into the church which the Mormons did not accept in the beginning. At any rate, however that may be, the Josephite Mormons, with their headquarters at Lamoni, in the State of Iowa, and wherever they are, no matter in what part of the country, are among the best of our citizens in all respects. They do not believe in polygamy; they never practiced polygamy. They discountenanced it. They do not believe in

church dictation in political affairs. They are the same as other church organizations, and to their religion no one has any objection. I am glad to call the attention of Senators to it, so that in the future we may not confuse the Josephite with the Brighamite Mormons.

I have in this brief sketch endeavored to convey an idea as to what the Mormon organization is. There has been no change in the spirit or intent of the Brighamite branch of the Mormon Church, to which Apostle SMOOT owes his complete allegiance, from its beginning down to the present day. Its methods in carrying out its objects differ from time to time and in different localities as the exigency demands. The Mormon Church is a government of its own in all things, and demands and receives of its followers their first and highest allegiance. Wherever it is sufficiently strong it completely dominates the State politically, as in Utah, and where it has a large minority of the population it dominates the State through its great balance of power, as in Idaho and Wyoming.

One of its chief tenets is the divine right of polygamy, to the practice of which it has clung tenaciously during all the years, and to which it tenaciously adheres to-day.

From its very inception this organization has been a menace to our form of government, and has been bitterly assailed wherever it has located itself by American citizens who have come in contact with it. There has been a perpetual conflict between it and the Government, with the exception of a few years following the issuance of the manifesto in 1890. I will refer to this later on in my remarks and give the reasons why there was a temporary cessation of hostilities between the United States Government and the government of the church during these years.

So opposed are the teachings and practices of this organization to the ordinary conception of what constitutes American citizenship and so offensive have been its practices that every President of the United States, from Buchanan down to McKinley, has called attention in his messages to Congress to the necessity for the most stringent legislation in restraint of their treasonable and obnoxious practices.

I should like to read the messages of Presidents Buchanan, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, and Cleveland (during his first term), but, with the consent of the Senate, will content myself by having them made a part of my argument.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Idaho will be printed in the RECORD as part of his remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXTRACT FROM FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT BUCHANAN.

A Territorial government was established for Utah by act of Congress approved the 9th September, 1850, and the Constitution and laws of the United States were thereby extended over it "so far as the same or any provisions thereof may be applicable." This act provided for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of a governor (who was to be ex officio superintendent of Indian affairs), a secretary, three judges of the supreme court, a marshal, and a district attorney. Subsequent acts provided for the appointment of the officers necessary to extend our land and our Indian system over the Territory. Brigham Young was appointed the first governor on the 20th September, 1850, and has held the office ever since. Whilst Governor Young has been both governor and superintendent of Indian affairs throughout this period, he has been at the same time the head of the church called the Latter-Day Saints, and professes to govern its members and dispose of their property by direct inspiration and authority from the Almighty. His power has been, therefore, absolute over both church and state.

The people of Utah almost exclusively belong to this church, and believing with a fanatical spirit that he is governor of the Territory by divine appointment, they obey his commands as if these were direct revelations from heaven. If, therefore, he chooses that his government shall come into collision with the Government of the United States, the members of the Mormon Church will yield implicit obedience to his will. Unfortunately, existing facts leave but little doubt that such is his determination. Without entering upon a minute history of occurrences, it is sufficient to say that all the officers of the United States, judicial and executive, with the single exception of two Indian agents, have found it necessary for their own personal safety to withdraw from the Territory, and there no longer remains any government in Utah but the despotism of Brigham Young. This being the condition of affairs in the Territory, I could not mistake the path of duty. As Chief Executive Magistrate I was bound to restore the supremacy of the Constitution and laws within its limits. In order to effect this purpose I appointed a new governor and other Federal officers for Utah and sent with them a military force for their protection and to aid as a posse comitatus in case of need in the execution of the laws.

With the religious opinions of the Mormons, as long as they remain mere opinions, however deplorable in themselves and revolting to the moral and religious sentiment of all Christendom, I had no right to interfere. Actions alone, when in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States, become the legitimate subjects for the jurisdiction of a civil magistrate. My instructions to Governor Cumming have therefore been framed in strict accordance with these principles. At their date a hope was indulged that no necessity might exist for employing the military in restoring and maintaining the authority of the law, but this hope has now vanished. Governor Young has by proclamation declared his determination to maintain his power by force, and has already committed acts of hostility against the United States. Unless he should retrace his steps the Territory of Utah will be in a state

of open rebellion. He has committed these acts of hostility notwithstanding Major Van Vliet, an officer of the Army, sent to Utah by the commanding general to purchase provisions for the troops, had given him the strongest assurances of the peaceful intentions of the Government, and that the troops would only be employed as a posse comitatus when called on by the civil authorities to aid in the execution of the laws.

There is reason to believe that Governor Young has long contemplated this result. He knows that the continuance of his despotic power depends upon the exclusion of all settlers from the Territory except those who will acknowledge his divine mission and implicitly obey his will, and that an enlightened public opinion there would soon prostrate institutions at war with the laws both of God and man. He has, therefore, for several years, in order to maintain his independence, been industriously employed in collecting and fabricating arms and munitions of war and in disciplining the Mormons for military affairs. As superintendent of Indian affairs he has had an opportunity of tampering with the Indian tribes and exciting their hostile feelings against the United States. This, according to our information, he has accomplished in regard to some of these tribes, while others have remained true to their allegiance and have communicated his intrigues to our Indian agents. He has laid in a store of provisions for three years, which in case of necessity, as he informed Major Van Vliet, he will conceal "and then take to the mountains and bid defiance to all the powers of the Government."

A great part of all of this may be idle boasting, but yet no wise government will lightly estimate the efforts which may be inspired by such frenzied fanaticism as exists among the Mormons in Utah. This is the first rebellion which has existed in our Territories, and humanity itself requires that we shall put it down in such a manner that it shall be the last. To trifle with it would be to encourage it and to render it formidable. We ought to go there with such an imposing force as to convince these deluded people that resistance would be in vain, and thus spare the effusion of blood. We can in this manner best convince them that we are their friends, not their enemies. In order to accomplish this object, it will be necessary, according to the estimate of the War Department, to raise four additional regiments, and this I earnestly recommend to Congress. At the present moment of depression in the revenues of the country I am sorry to be obliged to recommend such a measure; but I feel confident of the support of Congress, cost what it may, in suppressing the insurrection and in restoring and maintaining the sovereignty of the Constitution and laws over the Territory of Utah.

EXTRACT FROM THIRD ANNUAL MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT GRANT.

In Utah there still remains a remnant of barbarism repugnant to civilization, to decency, and to the laws of the United States. Territorial officers, however, have been found who are willing to perform their duty in a spirit of equity and with a due sense of the necessity of sustaining the majesty of the law. Neither polygamy nor any other violation of existing statutes will be permitted within the territory of the United States. It is not with the religion of the self-styled saints that we are now dealing, but with their practices. They will be protected in the worship of God according to the dictates of their consciences, but they will not be permitted to violate the laws under the cloak of religion.

It may be advisable for Congress to consider what, in the execution of the laws against polygamy, is to be the status of plural wives and their offspring. The propriety of Congress passing an enabling act authorizing the Territorial legislature of Utah to legitimize all children born prior to a time fixed in the act might be justified by its humanity to these innocent children. This is a suggestion only, and not a recommendation.

EXTRACT FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT GRANT.

In nearly every annual message that I have had the honor of transmitting to Congress, I have called attention to the anomalous, not to say scandalous, condition of affairs existing in the Territory of Utah, and have asked for definite legislation to correct it. That polygamy should exist in a free, enlightened, and Christian country, without the power to punish so flagrant a crime against decency and morality, seems preposterous. True, there is no law to sustain this unnatural vice; but what is needed is a law to punish it as a crime and at the same time to fix the status of the innocent children, the offspring of this system, and of the possibly innocent plural wives, but as an institution polygamy should be banished from the land.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT HAYES'S THIRD ANNUAL MESSAGE.

The continued deliberate violation by a large number of the prominent and influential citizens of the Territory of Utah of the laws of the United States for the prosecution and punishment of polygamy demands the attention of every department of the Government. This Territory has a population sufficient to entitle it to admission as a State, and the general interests of the nation, as well as the welfare of the citizens of the Territory, require its advance from the Territorial form of government to the responsibilities and privileges of a State. This important change will not, however, be approved by the country while the citizens of Utah in very considerable number uphold a practice which is condemned as a crime by the laws of all civilized communities throughout the world.

The law for the suppression of this offense was enacted with great unanimity by Congress more than seventeen years ago, but has remained until recently a dead letter in the Territory of Utah, because of the peculiar difficulties attending its enforcement. The opinion widely prevailed among the citizens of Utah that the law was in contravention of the constitutional guaranty of religious freedom. This objection is now removed. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided the law to be within the legislative power of Congress and binding as a rule of action for all who reside within the Territories. There is no longer any reason for delay or hesitation in its enforcement. It should be firmly and effectively executed. If not sufficiently stringent in its provisions, it should be amended; and in aid of the purpose in view I recommend that more comprehensive and more searching methods for preventing as well as punishing this crime be provided. If necessary to secure obedience to the law, the enjoyment and exercise of the rights and privileges of citizenship in the Territories of the United States may be withheld or withdrawn from those who violate or oppose the enforcement of the law on this subject.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT HAYES'S FOURTH ANNUAL MESSAGE.

It is the recognized duty and purpose of the people of the United States to suppress polygamy where it now exists in our Territories and to prevent its extension. Faithful and zealous efforts have been made by the United States authorities in Utah to enforce the laws against it. Experience has shown that the legislation upon this subject to be ef-

fective requires extensive modification and amendment. The longer action is delayed the more difficult it will be to accomplish what is desired. Prompt and decided measures are necessary. The Mormon sectarian organization which upholds polygamy has the whole power of making and executing the local legislation of the Territory. By its control of the grand and petit juries it possesses large influence over the administration of justice. Exercising, as the heads of this sect do, the local political power of the Territory, they are able to make effective their hostility to the law of Congress on the subject of polygamy, and, in fact, do prevent its enforcement. Polygamy will not be abolished if the enforcement of the law depends on those who practice and uphold the crime. It can only be suppressed by taking away the political power of the sect which encourages and sustains it.

The power of Congress to enact suitable laws to protect the Territories is ample. It is not a case for halfway measures. The political power of the Mormon sect is increasing. It controls now one of our wealthiest and most populous Territories. It is extending steadily into other Territories. Wherever it goes it establishes polygamy and sectarian political power. The sanctity of marriage and the family relation are the corner stone of our American society and civilization. Religious liberty and the separation of church and state are among the elementary ideas of free institutions. To reestablish the interests and principles which polygamy and Mormonism have imperiled and to fully reopen to intelligent and virtuous immigrants of all creeds that part of our domain which has been in a great degree closed to general immigration by intolerant and immoral institutions, it is recommended that the government of the Territory of Utah be reorganized.

I recommend that Congress provide for the government of Utah by a governor and judges or commissioners appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate—a government analogous to the provisional government established for the territory northwest of the Ohio by the ordinance of 1787. If, however, it is deemed best to continue the existing form of local government, I recommend that the right to vote, hold office, and sit on juries in the Territory of Utah be confined to those who neither practice nor uphold polygamy. If thorough measures are adopted, it is believed that within a few years the evils which now afflict Utah will be eradicated and that this Territory will in good time become one of the most prosperous and attractive of the new States of the Union.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT GARFIELD'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

The Constitution guarantees absolute religious freedom. Congress is prohibited from making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The Territories of the United States are subject to the direct legislative authority of Congress, and hence the General Government is responsible for any violation of the Constitution in any of them. It is therefore a reproach to the Government that in the most populous of the Territories the constitutional guaranty is not enjoyed by the people and the authority of Congress is set at naught. The Mormon Church not only offends the moral sense of manhood by sanctioning polygamy, but prevents the administration of justice through ordinary instrumentalities of law.

In my judgment it is the duty of Congress, while respecting to the uttermost the conscientious convictions and religious scruples of every citizen, to prohibit within its jurisdiction all criminal practices, especially of that class which destroy the family relations and endanger social order. Nor can any ecclesiastical organization be safely permitted to usurp in the smallest degree the functions and powers of the National Government.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT ARTHUR'S FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.

For many years the Executive, in his annual message to Congress, has urged the necessity of stringent legislation for the suppression of polygamy in the Territories, and especially in the Territory of Utah. The existing statute for the punishment of this odious crime, so revolting to the moral and religious sense of Christendom, has been persistently and contemptuously violated ever since its enactment. Indeed, in spite of commendable efforts on the part of the authorities who represent the United States in that Territory, the law has in very rare instances been enforced and, for a cause to which reference will presently be made, is practically a dead letter.

The facts that adherents of the Mormon Church, which rests upon polygamy as its corner stone, have recently been peopling in large numbers Idaho, Arizona, and other of our Western Territories is well calculated to excite the liveliest interest and apprehension. It imposes upon Congress and the Executive the duty of arraying against this barbarous system all the power which under the Constitution and the law they can wield for its destruction.

Reference has been already made to the obstacles which the United States officers have encountered in their efforts to punish violations of law. Prominent among these obstacles is the difficulty of procuring legal evidence sufficient to warrant a conviction even in the case of the most notorious offenders.

Your attention is called to a recent opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, explaining its judgment of reversal in the case of Miles who had been convicted of bigamy in Utah. The court refers to the fact that the secrecy attending the celebration of marriages in that Territory makes the proof of polygamy very difficult, and the propriety is suggested of modifying the law of evidence which now makes a wife incompetent to testify against her husband.

This suggestion is approved. I recommend also the passage of an act providing that in the Territories of the United States the fact that a woman has been married to a person charged with bigamy shall not disqualify her as a witness upon his trial for that offense. I further recommend legislation by which any person solemnizing a marriage in any of the Territories shall be required, under stringent penalties for neglect or refusal to file a certificate of such marriage in the supreme court of the Territory.

Doubtless Congress may devise other practical measures for obviating the difficulties which have hitherto attended the efforts to suppress this iniquity. I assure you of my determined purpose to co-operate with you in any lawful and discreet measures which may be proposed to that end.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT ARTHUR'S THIRD ANNUAL MESSAGE.

The Utah Commission has submitted to the Secretary of the Interior the second annual report. As the result of its labors in supervising the recent election in that Territory, pursuant to the act of March 22, 1882, it appears that persons by that act disqualified, to the number of about 12,000, were excluded from the polls. This fact, however, affords little cause for congratulation, and I fear it is far from indicating any real and substantial progress toward the extirpation of polygamy. All the members-elect of the legislature are Mormons. There is grave reason to believe that they are in sympathy with the

practices that this Government is seeking to suppress, and that its efforts in that regard will be more likely to encounter their opposition than to receive their encouragement and support. Even if this view should happily be erroneous, the law under which the Commissioners have been acting should be made more effective by the incorporation of some such stringent amendments as they recommend and as were included in bill No. 2238 on the Calendar of the Senate at its last session.

I am convinced, however, that polygamy has become so strongly entrenched in the Territory of Utah that it is proofless to attack it with any but the stoutest weapons which constitutional legislation can furnish. I favor, therefore, the repeal of the act upon which the existing government depends, the assumption by the National Legislature of the entire political control of the Territory, and the establishment of a commission with such powers and duties as shall be delegated to it by law.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT ARTHUR'S FOURTH ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.

The report of the Utah Commission will be read with interest.

It discloses the results of recent legislation looking to the prevention and punishment of polygamy in that Territory. I still believe that if that abominable practice can be suppressed by law it can only be by the most radical legislation consistent with the restraints of the Constitution.

I again recommend, therefore, that Congress assume absolute political control of the Territory of Utah and provide for the appointment of commissioners with such governmental powers as, in its judgment, may justly and wisely be put into their hands.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE.

In the Territory of Utah the law of the United States passed for the suppression of polygamy has been energetically and faithfully executed during the past year, with measurably good results. A number of convictions have been secured for unlawful cohabitation, and in some cases pleas of guilty have been entered and a slight punishment imposed, upon a promise by the accused that they would not again offend against the law, nor advise, counsel, or aid or abet in any way its violation by others.

The Utah commissioners express the opinion, based upon such information as they are able to obtain, that but few polygamous marriages have taken place in the Territory during the last year. They further report that while there can not be found upon the registration lists of voters the name of a man actually guilty of polygamy, and while none of that class are holding office, yet at the last election in the Territory all of the officers elected, except in one county, were men who, though not actually living in the practice of polygamy, subscribed to the doctrine of polygamous marriages as a divine revelation and a law unto all higher and more binding upon the conscience than any human law, local or national. Thus is the strange spectacle presented of a community protected by a republican form of government, to which they owe allegiance, sustaining by their suffrages a principle and a belief which set at naught that obligation of absolute obedience to the law of the land which lies at the foundation of republican institutions.

The strength, the perpetuity, and the destiny of the nation rest upon our homes, established by the law of God, guarded by parental care, regulated by parental authority, and sanctified by parental love.

These are not the homes of polygamy. The mothers of our land, who rule the nation as they mold the characters and guide the actions of their sons, live according to God's holy ordinances, and each, secure and happy in the exclusive love of the father of her children, sheds the warm light of true womanhood, unpolluted and unpolluted, upon all within her pure and wholesome family circle.

These are not the cheerless, crushed, and unwomanly mothers of polygamy.

The fathers of our families are the best citizens of the Republic. Wife and children are the sources of patriotism, and conjugal and parental affection beget devotion to the country. The man who, undetached with plural marriage, is surrounded in his single home with his wife and children has a stake in the country which inspires him with respect for its laws and courage for its defense.

These are not the fathers of polygamous families. There is no feature of this practice or the system which sanctions it which is not opposed to all that is of value in our institutions.

There should be no relaxation in the firm but just execution of the law now in operation, and I should be glad to approve such further discreet legislation as will rid the country of this blot upon its fair fame.

Since the people upholding polygamy in our Territories are reinforced by immigration from other lands, I recommend that a law be proposed to prevent the importation of Mormons into the country.

EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S FOURTH ANNUAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS.

It also appears from this report that though prior to March, 1885, there had been but six convictions in the Territories of Utah and Idaho under the laws of 1862 and 1882, punishing polygamy and unlawful cohabitation as crimes, there have been since that date nearly 600 convictions under these laws and the statutes of 1887; and the opinion is expressed that under such a firm and vigilant execution of these laws and the advance of ideas opposed to the forbidden practices, polygamy within the United States is virtually at an end.

Suits instituted by the Government under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, for the termination of the corporations known as the Perpetual Emigrating Fund Company and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints have resulted in a decree favorable to the Government, declaring the charters of these corporations forfeited and escheating their property. Such property, amounting in value to more than \$800,000, is in the hands of a receiver pending further proceedings, an appeal having been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will read the second and third messages of President Harrison to Congress bearing on this subject. (Vol. IX, pages 118 and 206, Messages and Papers of the Presidents.) This is what President Harrison said in his second message:

The increasing numbers and influence of the non-Mormon population of Utah are observed with satisfaction. The recent letter of Wilford Woodruff, president of the Mormon Church, in which he advised his people "to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the laws of the land," has attracted wide attention, and it is hoped that its influence will be highly beneficial in restraining infractions of the laws of the United States. But the fact should not be overlooked that the doctrine or belief of the church, that polygamous marriages are rightful and supported by divine revelation, remains unchanged. President Woodruff does not renounce the doctrine, but

refrain from teaching it and advises against the practice of it because the law is against it. Now, it is quite true that the law should not attempt to deal with the faith or belief of anyone, but it is quite another thing, and the only safe thing, so to deal with the Territory of Utah as that those who believe polygamy to be rightful shall not have the power to make it lawful.

It is to be regretted that the wise and statesmanlike warnings of President Harrison were not heeded. Mr. Harrison said in his third message to Congress:

The legislation of Congress for the repression of polygamy has, after years of resistance on the part of the Mormons, at last brought them to the conclusion that resistance is unprofitable and unavailing. The power of Congress over this subject should not be surrendered until we have satisfactory evidence that the people of the State to be created would exercise the exclusive power of the State over this subject in the same way. The question is not whether these people now obey the laws of Congress against polygamy, but, rather, would they make enforce, and maintain such laws themselves if absolutely free to regulate the subject? We can not afford to experiment with this subject, for when a State is once constituted the act is final and any mistake irremediable. No compact in the enabling act could, in my opinion, be binding or effective.

I will not read, but, with the consent of the Senate, will have inserted as a part of my remarks the manifesto of President Woodruff, in which he promises a cessation of polygamous living and an abandonment and giving up of that practice, and also a petition for amnesty signed by the authorities of the Mormon Church to President Harrison, in which they set forth that they will in the future cease living in polygamous relations, cease dominating the State politically, and beg the President of the United States for amnesty for their past crimes.

The papers referred to are as follows:

OFFICIAL DECLARATION.

To whom it may concern:

Press dispatches having been sent for political purposes from Salt Lake City, which have been widely published, to the effect that the Utah Commission, in their recent report to the Secretary of the Interior, allege that plural marriages are still being solemnized and that forty or more such marriages have been contracted in Utah since last June or during the past year; also that in public discourses the leaders of the church have taught, encouraged, and urged the continuance of the practice of polygamy.

I, therefore, as president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, do hereby, in the most solemn manner, declare that these charges are false. We are not teaching polygamy, or plural marriage, nor permitting any person to enter into its practice, and I deny that either forty or any other number of plural marriages have, during that period, been solemnized in our temples or in any other place in the Territory.

One case has been reported in which the parties alleged that the marriage was performed in the endowment house, in Salt Lake City, in the spring of 1889, but I have not been able to learn who performed the ceremony; whatever was done in this matter was without my knowledge. In consequence of the alleged occurrence the endowment house was, by my instructions, taken down without delay.

Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriages, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws and to use my influence with the members of the church over which I preside to have them do likewise.

There is nothing in my teachings to the church or in those of my associates during the time specified which can be reasonably construed to inculcate or encourage polygamy, and when any elder of the church has used language which appeared to convey any such teachings he has been promptly reproofed. And I now publicly declare that my advice to the Latter-Day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land.

WILFORD WOODRUFF,

President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

PETITION.

To the President:

We, the first presidency and apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, beg respectfully to present to Your Excellency the following facts:

We formerly taught to our people that polygamy, or celestial marriage, as commanded by God through Joseph Smith, was right; that it was a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come.

That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our president, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter-Day Saints up to a short time before September, 1890. Our people are devout and sincere and they accepted the doctrine and many personally embraced and practiced polygamy.

When the Government sought to stamp the practice out our people, almost without exception, remained firm, for they, while having no desire to oppose the Government in anything, still felt that their lives and their honor as men were pledged to a vindication of their faith, and that their duty toward those whose lives were a part of their own was a paramount one, to fulfill which they had no right to count anything, not even their own lives, as standing in the way. Following this conviction hundreds endured arrest, trial, fine, and imprisonment, and the immeasurable suffering borne by the faithful people no language can describe. That suffering, in abated form, still continues.

More, the Government added disfranchisement to its other punishments for those who clung to their faith and fulfilled its covenants.

According to our faith the head of our church receives, from time to time, revelations for the religious guidance of his people.

In September, 1890, the present head of the church, in anguish and prayer, cried to God for help for his flock, and received the permission to advise the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints that the law commanding polygamy was henceforth suspended.

At the great semiannual conference which was held a few days later this was submitted to the people, numbering many thousands, and representing every community of the people of Utah, and was by them in the most solemn manner accepted as the future rule of their lives.

They have since been faithful of the covenant made that day.

At the late October conference, after a year had passed by, the matter

was once more submitted to the thousands of people gathered together, and they again, in the most potential manner, ratified the solemn covenant.

This being the true situation, and believing that the object of the Government was simply the vindication of its own authority and to compel obedience to its laws, and that it takes no pleasure in persecution, we respectfully pray that full amnesty may be extended to all who are under disabilities because of the operation of the so-called "Edmunds and Edmunds-Tucker laws." Our people are scattered, homes are made desolate, many are still imprisoned, others are banished or in hiding. Our hearts bleed for these. In the past they followed our counsels, and while they are thus afflicted our souls are in sackcloth and ashes.

We believe there are nowhere in the Union a more loyal people than the Latter-Day Saints. They know no other country except this. They expect to live and die on this soil.

When the men of the South who were in rebellion against the Government, in 1865 threw down their arms and asked for recognition along the old lines of citizenship the Government hastened to grant their prayer.

To be at peace with the Government and in harmony with their fellow-citizens who are not of their faith, and to share in the confidence of the Government and people our people have voluntarily put aside something which all their lives they have believed to be a sacred principle.

Have they not the right to ask for such clemency as comes when the claims of both law and justice have been fully liquidated?

As shepherds of a patient and suffering people we ask amnesty for them and pledge our faith and honor for their future.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

WILFORD WOODRUFF.

GEORGE Q. CANNON.

JOSEPH F. SMITH.

LORENZO SNOW.

FRANKLIN D. RICHARDS.

MOSES THATCHER.

FRANCIS M. LYMAN.

H. J. GRANT.

JOHN HENRY SMITH.

JOHN W. TAYLOR.

M. W. MERRILL.

ANTHON H. LUND.

ABRAHAM H. CANNON.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will read the proclamation of President Harrison granting amnesty:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 4, 1893.

Whereas Congress by a statute approved March 22, 1882, and by statutes in furtherance and amendment thereof, defined the crimes of bigamy, polygamy, and unlawful cohabitation in the Territories and other places within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, and prescribed a penalty for such crimes; and

Whereas, on or about the 6th day of October, 1890, the Church of the Latter-Day Saints, commonly known as the "Mormon Church," through its president, issued a manifesto proclaiming the purpose of said church no longer to sanction the practice of polygamous marriages, and calling upon all members and adherents of said church to obey the laws of the United States in reference to said subject-matter; and

Whereas it is represented that since the date of said declaration the members and adherents of said church have generally obeyed said laws and have abstained from plural marriages and polygamous cohabitation; and

Whereas by petition dated December 19, 1891, the officials of said church, pledging the membership thereof to a faithful obedience to the laws against plural marriage and unlawful cohabitation, have applied to me to grant amnesty for past offenses against said laws, which request a very large number of influential non-Mormons residing in the Territories have also strongly urged; and

Whereas the Utah Commission, in their report bearing date September 15, 1892, recommend that said petition be granted and said amnesty proclaimed under proper conditions as to the future observance of the law, with a view to the encouragement of those now disposed to become law-abiding citizens; and

Whereas during the past two years such amnesty has been granted individual applicants in a very large number of cases, conditioned upon the faithful observance of the laws of the United States against unlawful cohabitation, and there are now pending many more such applications:

Now, therefore, I, Benjamin Harrison, President of the United States, by virtue of the powers in me vested, do hereby declare and grant a full amnesty and pardon to all persons liable to the penalties of said act by reason of unlawful cohabitation under the color of polygamous or plural marriage who have, since November 1, 1890, abstained from such unlawful cohabitation; but upon the express condition that they shall in the future faithfully obey the laws of the United States hereinbefore named, and not otherwise. Those who shall fail to avail themselves of the clemency hereby offered will be vigorously prosecuted.

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

By the President:

JOHN W. FOSTER, Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I call attention to these messages of the Presidents for two purposes: One, to indicate the views of our former Executives; the other, to mark the contrast between them and the present occupant of the White House. Mormonism is more insidious, more dangerous, and a greater menace to our Government and civilization to-day than it was at any particular period when these messages were addressed to Congress. Yet President Roosevelt does not deem the subject worthy of mention in a message filled with suggestions. A majority of a great committee of the Senate, after patient and exhaustive research, have reported that REED SMOOT is not entitled to his seat as a Senator. It was not a partisan report. It should not be a partisan subject. No President heretofore has made it a matter of partisan politics. President Roosevelt has.

Mr. President, I can not help but think that my position would be similar to that of a Senator from the South if he were asked to make a plea against negro domination in the South to an audience having the power to grant him relief, but which was ignorant of the subject in its detail. I imagine if I were a Senator from the State of Mississippi and were called upon to plead

for the American white citizenship of the South to a body powerful enough to grant relief, I would confine myself to the State of Mississippi, because negro domination in Mississippi is the same as negro domination in North Carolina or elsewhere.

I should like to make an impression on the Senate and the country, because I stand as the last representative of the American citizenship of the Rocky Mountain country opposed to the domination of the Mormon hierarchy in our politics; and I think perhaps it would be as well for me to do as I imagine I would do if I were from the South. I have lived among these people for a quarter of a century, for more than twenty-five years. I went there from Illinois, after having been graduated from an eastern college. I knew nothing of the Mormons. My lot fell there. My life has been spent there. Mormons everywhere are the same, and perhaps I had better tell you of conditions as they have been and now are in Idaho rather than to deliver a thesis on the Mormon question.

When, in 1880, I went to Blackfoot, where I now live, the polygamists were on all sides. They held the high church positions, the high official positions. No one could be preferred, either ecclesiastically or politically, unless he were a polygamist. There were no laws on the statute books then by which they could be punished, and I am sorry to say that in my State—Idaho—there are now no laws on our statute books by which they can be punished there. That has been my contention in my State—that we pass laws; but we can not; we are powerless.

That entire western country was divided into Territories in those days—Montana, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, the Dakotas. We had no Senators or Representatives in Congress then. If we had none now we would put an end to this question, as we did then, because then so flagrant had become the practices of this organization that the prayers and entreaties which went up from that western country finally reached your ears here in the East, penetrated your minds, and in March, 1882, Congress passed the Edmunds Act, which provided for the punishment of those living in unlawful cohabitation.

I had much to do with the enforcement of that act. Under it hundreds and thousands of Mormons were sent to the penitentiary for unlawful cohabitation, hundreds of them in southeastern Idaho. In no case did a judge ever sentence a convicted Mormon until he asked him the question, "Will you, in the future, agree to obey the laws of your country?" If the convicted one said, "I will," the judge allowed him to go free on his own parole. But in no instance did one of these convicted Mormons agree that in the future he would obey the laws of his country. The Mormons are very technical, and perhaps their defenders will be as technical; so I will qualify that statement by saying Bishop Sharp, in Utah, did agree to obey the laws of the country, and he was removed from office and pursued by the church in consequence thereof, so that no other Mormon attempted it.

The political domination of the Mormon leaders over their followers was as absolute then as it is now. There was a little difference in methods. They were more open and brutal then. Now they are more covert. Now they employ men by making them governors and Senators and Representatives to say there is no such thing. Then they made no pretense of concealment.

Conditions had become such in Idaho that there was organized an anti-Mormon party in the southeastern belt of Idaho which embraced every non-Mormon. In a fierce campaign, because in that great county the Mormons and Gentiles were about equally divided, the anti-Mormons won. They sent six members to the Territorial legislature of Idaho out of thirty-six. The sentiment of the Territory had been aroused. The good people from the other sections stood with the anti-Mormons of the southeast, and they passed through the Idaho legislature a test oath, so-called, under the provisions of which no Mormon voted or held office in Idaho for ten years.

Neither the Edmunds Act nor our action in Idaho seemed to make any impression on the Mormon people. They were just the same. They were just as defiant. So in 1887 Congress passed the Edmunds-Tucker Act, which provided additional penalties against these people and, amongst other things, took away from them their vast church belongings. Think of it, my brother Senators. From the beginning to this day and now and forever wherever there are Mormons living with Gentiles there is this perpetual conflict; and in the past Congress took away from it its church belongings, its church property. Would the American citizenship there during all these years do all those things to persecute any religious sect on account of its religion? Would your fellow American citizens there be making this fight now on account of anybody's religion? Does it not

occur to the Mormons themselves, or to you, perhaps, that there is something inherently wrong in their organization or else this conflict would not be perpetual?

Congress took away their property and put it into the hands of the United States marshal as a receiver. This did not seem to affect the Mormons. Congress contemplated other legislation. So that finally here they were, going to the penitentiary by the thousands; their church property had been taken away from them; they were disfranchised in one of the Territories; bills were pending in Congress, the Struble bill amongst others, to disfranchise them everywhere. They were sorely beset. Their leaders were in hiding or in the penitentiary. Their followers had left their families and fled into the mountain fastnesses to evade the officers of the law. It was a trying time. And in addition to that there was then what I am sorry to say I do not observe now—a movement among the younger members of the church against the leaders.

The younger members then said to the leaders, "You must give up this unequal contest. You can not carry on this struggle against the great power of the United States. You must live as other citizens live. You must obey the laws of the land. You must yield or we will be destroyed." Pressed on all sides, by the Government from without, by their younger men from within, President Woodruff, on the 25th day of September, 1890, issued a manifesto to the world that from that time on there would be no more polygamous living, there would be no more dictation by this organization in political affairs.

Unless one were in that fight in southeastern Idaho and in Utah in those days, he can not begin to comprehend or realize the sigh of relief which went up from our friends when that manifesto was issued. We had stood for ten years solidly arrayed one against the other—the Mormons there, the Gentiles here. We scarcely spoke to one another. We had no business or social relations. Life was hardly worth the living, so intense was the conflict. They were contending for what they thought to be a religious principle; we were contending for the sanctity and purity of the American home; and to-day in Utah and Idaho, in the southeastern part, the Gentiles are once more united, making a fight for the sanctity and the purity of the home, and once more they will win the fight.

We took the Mormons by the hand and said to them, "Let us forget past animosities; let us bury differences, and together we will live as American citizens and here build up a young Commonwealth to be the pride of our sister States." Every party hastened to remove the restrictions against the Mormons. I myself was the first. I think I can say—and I think my colleague will not charge me with egotism when I say—that at that time I was the undisputed leader of the Republican party of my State. I was its representative in this Chamber. I sent a letter to the chairman of our State committee on this subject, dated July 24, 1892, which I wish to read. I had just been elected to a six-year term in the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 24, 1892.

HON. EDGAR WILSON,
Chairman Republican State Central Committee,
Boise City, Idaho.

SIR: Your telegram inviting me to meet the Republican editors of the State on August 1 to consult with them regarding plans and measures and policies which will best tend to maintain the supremacy of Republican principles is at hand.

There is a local question still with us and with which our party has contended unitedly and aggressively for many years. I refer to the Mormons. I would like to be with you all to exchange views fairly and freely in regard to it. There is a law on our statute books which disfranchises them. So long as it remains there it is the duty of every good citizen to see that it is obeyed. The Mormons themselves will be quick to recognize the absolute necessity for this if, as they claim, they are now law-abiding citizens in every sense of the word.

Bad laws should be repealed. Laws which have been enacted to cure certain evils and which are harsh in their provisions, and in their workings make hardships for individuals, should likewise be promptly repealed when they have served their purpose and have cured the evils which they are enacted to correct. The Republican party has always been the party of liberty and progress, and it is its boast that it guarantees a free ballot and a fair count to every citizen, however humble. The course of our party on the Mormon question in Idaho in the past is one of which we may all feel justly proud. We made it a question of party fealty that its members should demand that the Mormons should give up polygamy and that the leaders of the Mormon Church should not exercise political control over their followers. Our party demanded that there should be no union of church and state, and that the individual members of the Mormon Church should be allowed to exercise, untrammelled, perfect freedom of action in all political affairs. The people of the State sustained our party in this position. The Mormons have acknowledged that we were right by openly and repeatedly proclaiming that they have abandoned polygamy and that their leaders no longer attempt nor will they attempt to use their positions to influence the judgment of their followers in political matters. If this is so, if polygamy has been given up for all time, if members of the Mormon Church are taking sides with the different parties according to their individual judgment and as their conscience dictates, the Republican party should be the first to extend to them the right hand of fellowship and to use its best endeavors to make them feel welcome as full citizens in every sense of the word. Our party, as a party, can not afford and

will not prosecute any class of men for past mistakes nor through prejudice.

Please extend to each one present individually my best wishes, and accept my sincere regrets that I can not be with you.

Yours, very truly,

FRED T. DUBOIS.

The church not only issued the manifesto, but a plea for amnesty was sent to President Harrison, signed by the authorities of the church, in which plea they set forth that from that time on there would be no more polygamous living nor would they dictate in political affairs, and asking pardon for past offenses. The authorities of the Mormon Church are twenty-six in number—the president and his two counselors, the twelve apostles, a patriarch, three high bishops, and seven presidents of the seventies, making twenty-six. But as a matter of fact, as was shown in the testimony, the authority is exercised by and resides in the first presidency and the twelve apostles. Every one of them signed this plea for amnesty, saying, I think, two, who were in Europe. They signed their names. These authorities have full control over their followers in all things. They speak for them, and when the president of the church receives a revelation from God it is binding on the church.

This manifesto of President Woodruff came to him as a revelation from God. That sounds queer in the United States Senate, but there is not a Mormon anywhere who does not believe that the president of his church receives communications directly from God Almighty—not one. In addition to that, when the president of this church receives a revelation from God and submits to the people of the church and they accept it, it is binding on them as a command from God. This manifesto received by the president from God Almighty was submitted to the Mormon people in conference shortly after its reception. There gather in the great temple in Salt Lake City twice in every year ten to fifteen thousand of the leaders of this church in their great conferences. At their first conference shortly after the manifesto was received it was submitted to the people, and these ten or fifteen thousand, speaking for all the people, with uplifted hands ratified and accepted the manifesto. And again, six months afterwards, in another conference the Mormon people accepted this manifesto which came to their president as a revelation from God. That is the record.

As I say, no one can understand the joy with which we accepted the changed conditions. The Republican party and the Democratic party in their first State conventions after the manifesto put planks in their platforms favoring the repeal of the statutes making effective our test oath, and in the legislature which followed, the legislature of 1893-94, the statutory provisions making effective our test oath were repealed, I think, without a dissenting voice. Gradually, too, since then all other statutes in Idaho reflecting on these people have been repealed. Gradually all your Congressional action has been repealed. The Edmunds-Tucker Act and the Edmunds Act were wiped out by statehood. You have restored to them their church property, and in 1896 we gave statehood to Utah, and it stood there as a sovereign State, with no law against it except those of its own manufacture and to be enforced by itself.

Things went along quietly after the manifesto and until statehood was secured for Utah. It was not long after that, however, before the signs became ominous, and I will tell you a few things which happened which have caused the renewal of this contest. It was none of our seeking; it was forced upon us by the church itself.

In the election of 1902 there appeared in southeastern Idaho a polygamous apostle, John Henry Smith, from Utah; a polygamous apostle, Mathias F. Cowley, of Utah, and a polygamous apostle, Francis Lyman, of Utah, all Republicans, who went among the Mormons and told them how they should vote. We all understood what it meant. That portion of Idaho was then Democratic. In the early days, when the Republican party was passing the Edmunds Act, there was not a Republican Mormon in Idaho; every Mormon in Idaho was a Democrat. There is not a Democratic Mormon in Idaho now.

I went down to one of the Mormon counties, Oneida, a Democratic county then, as they were divided. There was David L. Evans running for the State senate. His brother Lorenzo was chairman of the Democratic county committee. Both were Mormons. I met them. I said, "We are beaten; the church once more is taking possession of our politics." They said, "Yes, it is;" and David L. Evans, one of the brainiest men of the organization, wanted to withdraw the county ticket; but finally he concluded to let it go through. Mathias F. Cowley, the polygamist apostle of the Mormon Church from Utah, was going into this county of Oneida, distributing the Republican ticket to the church people, telling them it was the will of the Lord, and that they must obey Him politically as they did in spiritual affairs. After that, of course, they were successful.

In the legislature following the election in Idaho of 1902-3 this same polygamous apostle, John Henry Smith, of Utah, appeared at Boise City to pass a resolution through the Idaho legislature for a new constitutional convention to take the test oath out of the Idaho constitution. He testified about it before this committee, and so did Gentiles. He went to the leading Republicans there. He went to Governor Morrison, the Republican governor. John Henry Smith himself testifies that Morrison tried to dissuade him. I do not know that it had any bearing on it or not. Governor Morrison was a worthy gentleman, apparently a good governor. We generally give our governors two terms. He was not renominated. The solid Mormon vote was against him for renomination. Whether it was on account of the advice he gave John Henry Smith or not, I will not say. The editor of the Boise Statesman testified before the Committee on Privileges and Elections that John Henry Smith came to him and said: "I want a constitutional convention to take the test oath out of your constitution." He asked, "Why do you want to take it out?" He said, "Because it is obnoxious to our people." He replied, "You can not take it out. The people of Idaho will not submit to it. You will destroy the Republican party if you attempt it."

All the Republican leaders apparently gave him the same advice, and they thought they had dissuaded him, because he left the city. But he came back in about ten days and he slipped so quietly a resolution through the legislature calling for a constitutional convention, the avowed object of which was to take the test oath out, that no one knew it. It was not published in any paper. No one knew that we were to be confronted with such a question as that for six or eight months after its passage, and when the attention of the people of the State was called to the fact there was a protest from one end to the other, so much so that the attorney-general of the State, in answer to a communication, delivered an opinion, which was published, that the resolution had been improperly passed and, therefore, could not be submitted to the people. The only thing that restrained them was the knowledge on their part that the people of Idaho were not yet sufficiently educated to stand for that; the Mormons must be a little more patient before they can lead the people of Idaho up to that step, because unless that provision was in our constitution of Idaho to-day we would be as helpless as they are in Utah.

I know the attorney-general would not have rendered that opinion except for fear of the consequences, because the attorney-general then was a Mormon. The attorney-general then was a polygamist, and I stated time and time again in Idaho without contradiction that the attorney-general of Idaho, three years ago occupying the highest judicial office in that State, took a polygamous wife while attorney-general, and we can not pass laws in Idaho to punish him.

To show the utter subserviency to the Mormon power and the care which they exercise for their material interests, the same legislature in Idaho of 1902 and 1903 passed a sugar-bounty bill, which provided for the payment of a cent a pound on manufactured sugar for the first year and half a cent a pound for the second year and a flat bonus of \$20,000 for the sugar factories. It did not provide a bounty for the grower of the beet, the farmer. It gave it to the manufacturer, to the manufactured product, to the factory. There are three sugar-beet factories in full operation in Idaho now, one in my town, Blackfoot, with a capacity of 500 tons a day; one in my county, at Idaho Falls, with a like capacity, and another one in the adjacent county of Fremont, at Sugar City, with a capacity of 1,000 tons a day.

The president of the Mormon Church and the polygamous apostles are the directors of every one of these factories. So this legislature voted directly to the Mormon Church some three or four hundred thousand dollars as a bounty. They have put the Gentiles of that State to paying tithings the same as the Mormons.

The auditor of the State, one of the most capable auditors we have had, serving his first term, refused to pay the bounty when they presented it. The Mormons refused very promptly to renominate him as State auditor. The Democratic party of the State, however, called attention to these facts which I have narrated, and up to date the Republican party has not yet paid that bounty. But they passed the law, and it is there to-day. My judgment is that it is unconstitutional; but whether it is or not, the law was passed.

These were large incidents in Idaho. There were many smaller ones. At about the same time the apostle from Utah was elected a Senator of the United States from Utah. The right to his seat was questioned. An investigation was had. I happened to be a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections before I knew there was such a man as REED SMOOT.

I was on that committee when his case came before it. I heard all of that appalling testimony which has brought the blush of shame to the cheek of every right-thinking and pure-minded person in the world. I heard it all.

There come times to you, to every one of us, in our lives when we pause for most serious meditation. We are confronted with our conscience. There is an easy way for us to go, but there is a conscience which says you must go the other. It comes to all of us in our lives. It came to me. When I heard that testimony and when these occurrences took place in Idaho I thought of the bitter fight of ten years of my early manhood. When it was finished I thought no power on earth could induce me to enter upon another such. I wanted to flee from it all.

On the other hand, there were the people of Idaho, who had honored me far beyond any deserts of mine for twenty years. For twenty years, no matter to what party I had belonged, they had made me their leader. They were there, those good men and women, to follow again in a fight for American citizenship. I had to quit or I had to fight. It was none of my seeking.

I heard that testimony. You are all familiar with it. I shall not go into it in great detail. The president of the church, the president of the quorum of twelve apostles, who will become president of the church if he outlives the president, and the first five apostles in line of succession to the presidency all testified that they are now living in the polygamous relation, and everyone of them had signed his name to the solemn covenant made with the President of the United States to the people of the United States, that from that time on they would cease these practices.

Some men undertake to excuse them because they are old cases of polygamy, entered into years ago. The president of the church testified, the head of the quorum of apostles testified that their living in the polygamous relation now was not contrary to the laws of God and man. I ask these apologists for these old polygamists, "Where is your sympathy for the children? They are brought into this world to carry through life the awful brand that they come here contrary to the laws of God and man."

It was shown in this testimony that several of the apostles have gone into new polygamy since the manifesto. It was proved that John W. Taylor married two sisters, he being an apostle of the church, at the same ceremony, in 1897, he having two wives at the time.

I might say in passing that it is very common for polygamous Mormons to marry sisters. They do it almost invariably if the opportunity affords; and there is scarcely a leader among the Mormons in Utah to-day who is not married to two sisters. Joseph F. Smith himself is. This John W. Taylor, who married two sisters into polygamy in 1897, was one of the authorities who signed his name to the amnesty plea and who was granted pardon by the President of the United States. Do you attribute to the apostle Senator from Utah so little intelligence as to think that he did not know of these occurrences, sitting as a brother apostle with Taylor?

Abraham H. Cannon, another apostle who signed this plea for amnesty, married Lillian Hamlin as his wife in 1896, and the ceremony was performed by Joseph F. Smith, the president of the Mormon Church.

I do not know how much testimony you expected the committee to wring from the lips of reluctant Mormon witnesses. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan, referred to the cases of Thatcher and Roberts from a political standpoint. They were candidates, respectively, for Congress and the United States Senate on the Democratic ticket, Thatcher having been nominated in the State convention. In the middle of the campaign the church issued a ruling that no officer of the church, from a bishop up, inclusive, could be a candidate for office without getting the consent of the church. Thatcher and Roberts were the most conspicuous Mormons of them all, the two most eloquent men of the church, and I think Thatcher was the most beloved man in his church, the most beloved of any who has appeared among them for twenty years, and the authorities evidently intended to make a lasting example of these two shining lights. They had a reconvened Democratic State convention in Utah, which undertook to denounce this action of the church. Thatcher published letter after letter and made speech after speech, claiming that as an American citizen he had a right to aspire to office, notwithstanding the orders of his church, and Roberts did the same thing.

They carried the controversy into the election. Their addresses appealed to the highest type of American citizenship and would have been a credit to American statesmanship anywhere. Both were beaten at the polls, the Republicans winning the election. Both were candidates two years after for

the same offices, but in the meantime Roberts had recanted, had written an open letter saying that the church had a right to dominate him and all other followers in politics. He then asked the consent of the church to become a candidate for Congress. Consent was given by the church. Thatcher continued his opposition. The Democrats were successful, and Roberts was elected to Congress. The legislature was Democratic, and the Mormon leaders then took away from Thatcher his Democratic following, and finally had one Republican Mormon change his vote in order to elect some one besides Thatcher.

REED SMOOT in the committee's investigation was asked if it was necessary for him to get the consent of the president of the church to become a candidate for the United States Senate, and he said yes. Joseph F. Smith was asked if it was necessary for Senator SMOOT to get his consent, and he said it was. Some Senator, I think it was the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], asked, and the same question may occur to you perhaps, what would become of one if he would insist on running notwithstanding he did not get the consent of the church. That question was asked, I think, of Roberts, but, at any rate, whoever answered the question, whatever Mormon it was, on the witness stand, he replied that he would be out of harmony with the quorum.

Now, it does not seem probably very dreadful to you, Senators, to be out of harmony with your quorum, but it is of considerable moment to a Mormon. Mr. Thatcher was out of harmony with his quorum, and after they had beaten him out of the Senatorship they took away his apostleship. They dropped him. They took away every ecclesiastical office which he had, until now, I think, he is the only Mormon living who has not any office. They stripped him of his temporal possessions. They have reduced him to nothing. They made him a pitiable object. They destroyed him financially, ecclesiastically, physically, and finally made him apologize abjectly in a written open letter to the world in which he said "the church has a perfect right to command me in all things." That is what it means to be out of harmony with your quorum.

So far as the Gentiles of Utah and Idaho are concerned, it is about equally as bad with them. We had a Democratic platform in Idaho in 1904, which reads as follows—this is the 1904 platform:

We demand the extermination of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation within the State of Idaho and the complete separation of church and state in political affairs.

We had hard work to pass that plank. There were many Mormons in the convention. But it was finally adopted, and it cost the Democratic party every Mormon vote in Idaho. That was the sum total of the platform. That was all there was to it. That was in the 1904 campaign. We went before the people demanding the power to enact laws to punish these people and to separate the church from the state in politics. Finally, at the end of the campaign, the Republican leaders from the stump pledged the people that if they were given the power again they would enact adequate laws. That pledge was made by Governor Gooding and Judge Richards and two or three other leading Republicans plainly and everywhere. The people evidently took them at their word, because Idaho is strongly Republican, and they preferred to remain with their party. So they voted the Republicans in almost overwhelmingly; and the first thing that the Republicans did when they met in legislature was to elect a Mormon bishop speaker.

There was a judge, J. H. Richards, one of the leading attorneys of the State, who had canvassed the entire State pledging the Republicans to the enactment of sufficient legislation. He is a man of high character and standing in the party. While he was making the campaign through the State he was elected to the legislature from Boise City, Ada County. When the legislature assembled he introduced bills against unlawful cohabitation and for a change of venue—what we had then been demanding. They were carefully drawn, carefully considered bills. He introduced them. The Mormons and the Republican authorities throttled them and passed what they called an "administration bill"—that is, a bill against polygamy—and, as I have demonstrated here to-day, you might as well pass a bill to divide the moon into four equal parts, so far as its effectiveness is concerned, as to pass a law against polygamy. It is a dead letter. They stifled the bill against unlawful cohabitation, because under that we could punish these practices, provided we had a change of venue.

Polygamous children are being born constantly in my State. We have the names, we have the dates, but we can not prosecute the polygamous parents. The Mormons absolutely control in southeastern Idaho as they do in Utah, and even more so. If the officers are not Mormons, they are those who were elected by the Mormons and are dependent upon them, and in these

Mormon communities in southeastern Idaho you can not any more than you can in Utah proceed against these offenders; and not so well in Idaho, because we have not the laws. In numerous instances I see their political power here as well as in Idaho. They have become an object of solicitude now. They are a political factor because they control Senators and electoral votes and Members of Congress. They are to be reckoned with, not as a criminal organization, but as a political factor.

I will refer to an old soldier. I will not call attention to a number of things that I could, but will confine myself mostly to the political aspect of it. There was an old soldier, a major in the Union Army, who was holding the postmastership in the town of Montpelier, in Bear Lake County. It is a Mormon county, strongly so, but Montpelier itself is a divided town. From what I gather and from my knowledge I should think that considerably more than one-half of the business of the post-office at Montpelier is done by Gentiles. This Major Underwood was a Gentile. His place was filled by the appointment of a Mormon bishop, and the Gentiles of Montpelier protested to me, and I went to the Departments about it. The Gentiles thought that they ought to have that office. I called the attention of the President and the Postmaster-General to the facts in the case, but without avail. I can not better tell the story than by reading my letters to both the President and the Postmaster-General. The letter to the President is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 22, 1906.

To the PRESIDENT:

I hand you herewith some papers in regard to the appointment of the Mormon postmaster at Montpelier, Idaho. I have no recommendation to make as to the appointee. There are a number of qualified Gentiles in Montpelier, any one of whom would be glad to be postmaster.

I am sure that it would be much more in the line of good government if Congressman FRENCH would select a postmaster from among the Gentiles. I think a mistake was made in displacing the present postmaster.

Unless a Gentile is appointed postmaster at Montpelier the very large Gentile population of this county will not have a representative in any office, county or Federal. It does seem to me that no church, or alleged church, is so superior in its membership that every office in the county should be in the possession and under the control of this organization. I have an agreement with my colleague, Senator HEBURN, that the Senate will pass upon the confirmation of Mr. Winters, the Mormon bishop, Thursday, the 28th. I will acquiesce in your decision. If you think the Gentiles, under the circumstances, are entitled to this position, and will ask Mr. FRENCH to recommend a Gentile and will get him to consent to the withdrawal of Mr. Winters for that purpose, you will gratify those in Montpelier who are not Mormons, as well as myself. If you think, under the circumstances, that Mr. Winters should be confirmed and will so intimate to me, I will raise no objection. I ask that you kindly give me your answer before Thursday of this week.

Respectfully,

FRED T. DUBOIS.

I received no answer to that communication. I wrote the following letter to Postmaster-General Cortelyou:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 30, 1906.

HON. GEORGE B. CORTELYOU,

Postmaster-General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CORTELYOU: I hand you herewith another petition for the appointment of Marcus F. Whitman as postmaster at Montpelier, Idaho.

I desire to call attention to this fact, that all the county offices in Bear Lake County, where Montpelier is situated, are held by Mormons, and every Federal office, excepting the post-office at Montpelier, is held by Mormons.

Montpelier is a Gentile town, a considerable majority of the people being Gentiles.

I inclosed with the letters filed with you a little typewritten statement showing the vote of the county for President and governor and lieutenant-governor at the last election, from which it will be seen that the Republican vote was between 1,500 and 1,600 and the Democratic vote between 300 and 400.

At the same election there was a Gentile candidate for superintendent of schools and for treasurer on the Republican county ticket, yet both of them were beaten by Mormons who were running for the same offices on the County Democratic ticket.

The situation there means the disfranchisement of every American citizen by this political organization which calls itself a church.

The domination of this so-called "church" in political affairs and the complete union of church and state is perfectly exemplified in this county of Bear Lake, Idaho. Under existing circumstances the American citizens there are helpless so far as county affairs are concerned, but I do think they are entitled to the support of the National Government in the unequal fight in which they are engaged in trying to maintain American citizenship.

Respectfully,

FRED T. DUBOIS.

I received no answer to that communication.

Now, I will read you the Democratic platform adopted prior to the last election; and when I am describing conditions in Idaho, I am describing conditions wherever Mormons are found, and these are so familiar to me that no one can dispute any statement which I make. There was this plank in our platform during the last election, viz:

STATE BOARD OF HEALTH LAW.

We pledge the party to enact a State board of health law for the control of contagious and infectious diseases, and for the collection of vital statistics.

It was rather strange that it was necessary to put a plank of that sort in a political platform. Idaho is the only State in the Union which does not have such a law. It is one of the most favored States. Our climate is such that if vital statistics were published, the State would become famous as a health resort. Yet we can not pass a law to control contagious or infectious diseases or to collect vital statistics, because, of necessity, it carries with it a provision for a registration of births, and the Mormons in the legislature and the Republican leaders will not let us pass such a law. The Mormons say so openly. They do not disguise it. They say, "You can not pass that law, because you could then locate the polygamists, and our people would not submit to it."

A Democratic State senator from south Idaho, in the legislature before the last, spent almost the entire session—and he is a doctor—trying to get such a bill through, but he failed. The medical association of the State has been urging it for years. A Republican doctor and State senator from north Idaho spent the last session in trying to have a similar bill passed, and he failed for the same reason. We adopted our plank of 1904 in our last State platform demanding the extermination of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation within the State of Idaho, as follows:

EXTERMINATION OF POLYGAMY AND UNLAWFUL COHABITATION.

We demand the extermination of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation within the State of Idaho and the complete separation of church and state in political affairs. We pledge the people of Idaho that, in the event of Democratic success at the polls in November, we will make effective by legislative enactment the wise and patriotic declarations in our State constitution, contained in section 3, Article VI, which reads as follows:

"No person is permitted to vote, serve as a juror, or hold any civil office who is under guardianship, idiotic, or insane; or who has, at any place, been convicted of treason, felony, embezzlement of the public funds, bartering or selling, or offering to barter or sell, his vote, or purchasing or offering to purchase the vote of another, or other infamous crime, and who has not been restored to the rights of citizenship, or who, at the time of such election, is confined in prison on conviction of a criminal offense; or who is a bigamist or polygamist, or who is living in what is known as patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or in violation of any law of this State or of the United States forbidding any such crime, or who in any manner teaches, advises, counsels, aids, or encourages any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or to live in violation of any such law, or to commit any such crime; or who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society, which teaches, advises, counsels, encourages, or aids any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage, or which teaches or advises that the laws of this State prescribing rules of civil conduct are not the supreme law of the State; nor shall Chinese, or persons of Mongolian descent, not born in the United States, nor Indians not taxed, who have not severed their tribal relations and adopted the habits of civilization, either vote, serve as jurors, or hold any civil office."

That is the test oath. The platform further declared:

We favor further legislation in harmony with the unanimous recommendation of our supreme court to the last session of the legislature, providing for a change of venue on the application of the State upon a proper showing on behalf of the prosecution that justice demands such change.

I will say in passing that the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously affirmed the constitutionality of that act, and complimented the people of Idaho for having passed it. The Congress of the United States, the Senate, after great deliberation, admitted Idaho to statehood with that provision in our constitution, knowing full well what it meant. The next clause of our State constitution, following immediately after that, says:

SECTION IV, ARTICLE VI. The legislature may prescribe qualifications, limitations, and conditions for the right of suffrage additional to those prescribed in this article, but shall never annul any of the provisions in this article contained.

That is the constitution of the State of Idaho.

Immediately after that was passed—and it was passed unanimously—delegates had come there from every portion of the State, and the Democratic party of Idaho was in a more hopeless minority than it is in Vermont. Two years before that its candidates had not received nearly one-half of the votes of the State. The party had driven from their support all the Mormons; yet they were there in their seats in that convention in Coeur d'Alene, in the extreme north of the State. The Democratic party put that plank in their platform which said from this time on no Democratic politician shall trade or barter away the principles and rights of the people of this State for a Mormon vote. They had no hope or expectation of winning. Every Democratic county convention in the Mormon counties repudiated that platform and the Democratic party after it was passed. In Fremont County the Mormons nominated on the Republican ticket six members of the legislature, all of whom were Mormon bishops. The other Mormons nominated what they called a citizens' ticket. They also put up for the legislature six Mormon bishops. The American citizenship party there nominated

a ticket, but it was, of course, hopelessly beaten. In my county of Bingham the Mormons nominated a Democratic ticket, so called, but they repudiated that platform, denounced the Democratic State ticket, and put up candidates for the legislature pledged to vote, at any rate, against the nominees of the Democratic State convention. In my county the Americans nominated a ticket; and I am proud to state that it received a great many more votes than the so-called Democratic ticket.

In Oneida County they nominated four bishops on each ticket—three or four, I have forgotten the exact number—and in Bear Lake County they did the same, repudiating utterly the Democratic party on account of that platform.

I will ask that the address of the chairman of the Democratic committee of the State of Idaho, Mr. Lockhart, be inserted in the RECORD. I will not read it. The address is confined entirely to the Mormon question.

The address referred to is as follows:

CHAIRMAN LOCKHART'S ADDRESS ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

To the people of Idaho:

In view of the great consequences which will arise from the campaign of 1906, and which may reflect for good or evil the destinies of the people of Idaho for a long time to come, I have deemed it proper that a statement should be given to the people of this State relative to the course to be pursued by the Democratic State Committee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

A convention of the Democratic party lately held in Coeur d'Alene City has declared in unmistakable words that polygamy and unlawful cohabitation must cease, and that the interference in the political affairs of this State by the Mormon hierarchy must stop; and it pledged itself, if given the power by the people at the polls, to carry into effect by statutes punishing such offenses, that clause of the State constitution which has heretofore been at once the bulwark of morality and decency in the homes of this State and the weapon of defense against the political domination of an unscrupulous and selfish alien oligarchy which seeks to confuse the religious sentiments of its people by directing them in their political actions.

NO PARTISANSHIP DICTATED COURSE.

No partisanship has dictated the course of the Democratic party in presenting this issue, for at all times, disregarding the possibilities of deriving advantage by truckling to the Mormon hierarchy, the Democratic party has sought to occupy the high ground of citizenship which looks solely to the welfare of the State and the preservation of those homes which are at once the glory and safeguard of a republic.

POLYGAMY IN IDAHO.

We affirm unhesitatingly that polygamy is not only practiced in this State, but is increasing to an alarming extent, and if the people of Idaho will intrust the affairs of government of the State of Idaho to the nominees of the Coeur d'Alene convention and the legislators from the various counties who indorse the Coeur d'Alene platform, we will pass such laws at the next session of the Idaho legislature as will enable us to prove this assertion; without laws we are powerless to act. We affirm that children, the future citizens of this State, are being born branded with illegitimacy and deprived of their legal birthright, and reared in an atmosphere which must undermine their moral natures. To absolutely stamp out this crime, prohibited by the moral sense of mankind, and to rescue these little children, so that each may stand equal in the eyes of the law, unshamed of its parentage, we appeal to the motherhood of this State to stretch out protecting arms over the children reared in this vicious practice of unlawful cohabitation.

WOMEN'S PRIVILEGE AND DUTY.

The women of Idaho have been given at once a great privilege and a great duty, and we urge them so to act in this campaign that the claims made in their behalf shall be vindicated, viz, whenever a question of morality should be presented to the people, the votes of the women would be cast fearlessly for the right. Can you, women of Idaho, looking into the clear, innocent eyes of your children, fail to help us free the polygamous children of the curse of bastardy? Was it not taught on the shores of Galilee that, "It were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he be cast into the sea, rather than that he should offend one of these little ones." Is that not living truth to-day in Idaho? Is not the question whether or not you will continue to permit these little ones to be offended put straight to the hearts of the women of Idaho to-day in this campaign; or whether, joining with us, you will put down forever the practice of polygamy in this State? There have appeared apologists for the old polygamists, but who, if not women of this State, shall be heard in defense of their young children?

FRENCH'S TESTIMONY.

The State of Idaho stands pilloried before the United States, placed there by the sworn testimony of Representative French before the REED SMOOT investigating committee of the United States Senate, where, sitting between two polygamous apostles of the Mormon Church, he unblushingly testified that the people of Idaho condoned the crime of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation in the cases of old polygamists. Do you, women of Idaho, condone the birth of children of old polygamists, tainted from their infancy with this system of crime? (Last July a forty-third child was born to the third polygamous wife of Joseph F. Smith, president of the Mormon Church.) Are we to allow this statement to stand regarding Idaho, or will the earnest men and women of this State repudiate it?

CHURCH INTERFERENCE.

No less momentous in its effects upon the future of Idaho is the interference in political affairs of the Mormon hierarchy. As is well known, the Mormon voters hold the balance of power between the two great parties—the Republican and Democratic—and these Mormon voters are absolutely controlled by the hierarchy. It is possible for the authorities of the Mormon Church, sitting in Salt Lake City, to say to either party in Idaho: "If you will agree to our demands, we

will place you in power." It can say to any individual in either party: "If you agree to support measures favorable to us, we will make you Senator, governor, or put you in whatever office you may aspire to." Is not this great power inimical to the best interests of the State? Will it not build up in our politics the system of "bossism," to trample upon the aspirations of our people? Was not this great power of the Mormon hierarchy lately exerted at Pocatello, when in a convention in which three polygamists sat two men were permitted to prepare a "slate" and parcel out the offices of this State without regard to the choice of the people, but always with the approval of the Mormon leaders? The motto of that convention seems to have been: "If we can please the hierarchy, the people can be disregarded."

APOSTLES COME TO IDAHO.

Have we not seen in Boise the polygamous apostle, John Henry Smith, of the Mormon Church, endeavoring to coerce a legislature and to change the clear provisions of the constitution of Idaho against polygamy, which he said was so objectionable to his people, and has not this been testified to by the leading Republicans of Idaho?

Have we not seen the polygamous apostle Matthias Cowley masquerading as a book agent and visiting homes in Oneida County with the statement that inasmuch as he was the spiritual adviser of the people they must listen to him in political affairs? Have not the people of this State seen Apostle Penrose, likewise a polygamist, leaving his office in Salt Lake City and coming at the request of political leaders in Fremont County, Idaho, and changing its political complexion in a night? Is there, in this demand that the Mormon hierarchy should refrain from interfering in the political affairs in Idaho, any partisan politics? If so, then the evidence of leading men both in the Democratic and Republican parties must be disregarded.

LAST LEGISLATURE.

Who can view the last session of the Idaho legislature without the blush of shame mantling his cheek? Did not Representative Ainey, a Republican, of Canyon County, stand up in the house of representatives and declare that he had been approached by members of the ecclesiastical organization and told that if he voted for certain measures his usefulness as a legislator was ended? Have the men of Idaho become so docile in their subjection to Joseph F. Smith, of Salt Lake, that such a statement can be made by one of their representatives and they not resent it? Was it partisan politics when, acting under their constitutional duty, the judges of the supreme court of this State wisely suggested to the legislature of this State that a change of venue bill be passed in the interest of justice? And yet was this Democratic politics when this measure advocated by the supreme court (composed of two Republicans and one Democrat) and introduced by so prominent a Republican as Judge Richards, of Ada County, in the house, the Mormon speaker left the chair and, descending to the floor of the house, characterized the bill as the weapon of character assassins and with passion declared it an insult aimed at the Mormon people. Why? When this change of venue bill was being discussed in the senate Senator McBeth, in advocating its enactment, stated that if this bill should be passed it would be the death blow to polygamy, and on this statement, notwithstanding the recommendation of the supreme court of the State and in order to continue this abhorrent practice, the influence of the Mormon hierarchy in the senate forthwith killed it.

POWER OF CHURCH.

Are the citizens of Idaho, who are trying to lift Idaho to the high place occupied by her sister States in civic authority and public morality, to be called partisan when they insist that laws that have proven efficacious in other States in preventing disease and in fostering public health be adopted in this State? If in agitating against the control of the affairs of Idaho by the Mormon hierarchy we be called partisan, we point to the experience of Doctor France, Republican representative from Shoshone County in the last legislature, as an example of the power of the church to oppose and defeat the best interests of this people. Doctor France, at the request of the State medical board, introduced a board of health bill, which in effect provided the machinery for stamping out epidemics and contagious diseases and provided for the collection of the vital statistics of the State. Idaho is the only State of the American Union which has not such a law, and to the credit of the medical profession of the State, they endeavored to place Idaho in line with the best medical and scientific information by collating and copying the best part of each law from the different States on this subject. Doctor France introduced this bill, and was thereupon told by the representatives of this Salt Lake hierarchy that if he eliminated the provision regarding the registration of births the bill could be passed, otherwise it could not. Upon his refusal to truckle to this plainly immoral demand the bill met the same fate as its predecessors by being defeated at the hands of the Mormon influence. Thus to hide the evidence that they still preach and practice polygamy the Salt Lake hierarchy have exposed the people of Idaho to contagious disease and possibly death by keeping the State from having the necessary machinery to effectually quarantine against disease.

THE GREAT ISSUE.

There is but one issue to be presented to the people of the State in view of these incontrovertible facts above stated, viz, whether or not the people of Idaho shall enjoy political independence and whether or not they shall cleanse this State of the crimes now being practiced within its borders. I shall not permit the personalities of the different candidates to enter into the discussion, but shall insist at all times that the question of the sanctity of the home and political liberty is greater than the aspirations of any candidate: that the great question to be answered and settled at the polls in November is whether vice shall be effectively suppressed and individual political liberty be preserved to each citizen of Idaho. We must make sure that the State lives before we discuss the question of politics.

APPEAL TO PATRIOTIC CITIZENS.

I am not appealing to the partisan sentiments of the Democratic party, but, rather, I am addressing in this campaign all the citizens of Idaho regardless of party: to Democrats and Republicans alike, because their interests are being injured in the most vital places; to the women of Idaho, regardless of party affiliations, because crime is practiced in this State which particularly affects them. We have before us the ever-continuing struggle of a democracy—the preservation of a liberty dearly bought and heroically maintained. It is a fight for first principles and all that is most dear to men.

Before any other question can be answered the people of this State must, by their solemn votes, affirm that liberty is dearer to them than their party affiliations and that the purity of the home must be pre-

served and that the children born in this great Commonwealth shall face the world without a stain upon their birth. For the accomplishment of these great ends I appeal to the whole people of Idaho to unite with the Democratic party so that the pledges of its platform may be enacted into the laws of the land.

H. W. LOCKHART, *Chairman.*

BOISE, IDAHO, August 30, 1906.

Mr. DUBOIS. I will read the letter of the chairman to those whom he invited to speak for the Democratic party during the campaign. It is as follows:

CHAIRMAN LOCKHART'S LETTER TO SPEAKERS.

MY DEAR SIR: The campaign in this State is going to be a very interesting one. The greatest question to be submitted to the voters of Idaho is whether or not the Mormon hierarchy is going to dominate in the political affairs or whether the people of this State are going to settle the question this time by making it plain that the good people of Idaho will never submit to church dictation of politics and the practices of those vices which are against the moral sentiment and the law of the land.

We are very anxious to enlist in this campaign the services of those who believe in advocating strongly a straightforward fight along the lines of noninterference in politics by the Mormon church and the eradication of the practice of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation. We desire very much to have the services of such as speakers in this campaign, and I cordially extend to you, on behalf of the committee, an invitation to speak at such places and at such times as the committee can avail themselves of your services, and we would appreciate it very much if you would kindly respond to this letter at your very earliest convenience.

Thanking you for your prompt response, I remain,

Yours, truly,

W. H. LOCKHART,

Chairman Democratic State Committee.

BOISE, IDAHO, September 1, 1906.

The whole campaign from beginning to end was made on the Mormon question. We put in our platform a plank lamenting the death of ex-Governor Steunenberg and calling for justice to be meted out to his murderers. The Republican State platform was entirely silent on that question. Not a speaker, not even the governor himself, at the State convention said one word about this subject. Our recent candidate for governor is and was the chief justice of Idaho. As chief justice he handed down the decision in the Moyer-Haywood cases, denying the writ of habeas corpus, which decision has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. There was no law or order issue in Idaho of that kind.

Senator HEYBURN, my colleague, made a speech in Boise City on Friday evening, September 14, 1906, which, I presume, you might call a keynote speech. I addressed the people of Boise from the same platform in the same theater on the Tuesday preceding. My colleague was kind enough to attend my meeting, but I was not in Boise when he spoke. I presume my speech was a keynote speech, and his was in answer and a keynote speech for his party. Among other things, my colleague in a measure ridiculed me for putting in our platform the provision regarding the enforcement of our State constitution. In that carefully prepared speech at Boise, after reciting in full the test oath which I have just read to you, my colleague said:

That is the constitution; that is higher law than any statute. The legislature, without regard to party lines, repealed the statute on that subject. They needed no statute; the constitution is sufficient to prevent them from voting. If they come within this provision, they are disfranchised now.

I think that is good doctrine, whether or not it is sound law, especially when our State constitution says further that the legislature shall not take out any of those limitations in our constitution.

At the end of the campaign we instructed our men to challenge the Mormons at the polls; to present to them that constitutional provision, and ask that they conform to the constitutional requirement before they voted. I will ask the Secretary to read what our chairman says in regard to challenging voters.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

REGARDING CHALLENGES.

To the people of Idaho:

At the beginning of the present campaign I addressed you in an open letter in which I insisted, in obedience to the mandate of the Democratic State convention, which was held at Coeur d'Alene city on August 6, the Mormon question was the paramount issue in Idaho politics and that the Republican party, as a result of their State convention held at Pocatello on August 1, were firmly allied with the Mormon Church.

The Democratic State campaign has been conducted in entire harmony with the spirit and letter of the Democratic State convention. The Republican State campaign has been conducted in entire harmony with my suggestion in my former address at the beginning of this campaign, that the Republican party was firmly allied with the Mormon Church.

In his final address to the election judges of the State of Idaho James H. Brady, chairman of the Republican State central committee, emphasizes this fact and shows now for his party an attempt to ride over the constitution of the State of Idaho and to curry favor with the cohorts of his organization, the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-

Day Saints. This is especially emphasized in his closing sentence, which is as follows:

"Any attempt to challenge voters on account of their being members of churches or organizations, or associations, or on account of their religious or other beliefs is illegal and is an intimidation of voters, and it is your sworn duty to see that this is not done."

Senator HEYBURN, in an address delivered at Columbia Theater, Boise, on Friday evening, September 14, 1906, said, after reading the Idaho test oath:

"That is the constitution; that is higher law than any statute. The legislature, without regard to party lines, repealed the statute on that subject. They needed no statute; the constitution is sufficient to prevent them from voting. If they come within this provision they are disfranchised now."

The Democratic State central committee has undertaken to and will call to account at the polls, by way of challenging, all the Mormons which it is possible to reach by challenge, that they may be made to comply with the spirit and letter of our constitution, which is the fundamental law of the State of Idaho, and with that part in particular found in section 3 of Article VI. This announcement was made a week ago, since which time Governor Gooding and the Republicans generally who belong to his machine have threatened our challengers with arrest. They put this on the flimsy ground that it is the desire of our organization to delay this election.

Our challengers are hereby instructed to preserve order and to act with all possible dispatch. The appeal by the governor and this notice of Chairman Brady to the election judges of the State are exciting trouble. The notice of Chairman Brady to the judges of election is issued for the purpose of avoiding the issue.

The American people must rally to us and help us in the defense of the people exercising the legal rights of the citizens, and our challengers should be supported in doing their duty. The Democratic State central committee will stand behind everybody while performing his duty both before and after election.

The claim of Chairman Brady that none but judges of election can challenge voters is erroneous and unwarranted by law. The law relating to challengers (see Session Laws of 1899, pp. 52 and 53 and secs. 77 to 86, inclusive) provides that any elector may challenge anyone who offers to vote, and should do so if he believes the person is not a qualified voter. There is no law forbidding an elector challenging anyone who offers to vote. The wording of section 5, above referred to, says:

"It shall be the duty of any judge of election to challenge any person offering to vote whom he believes not to be qualified as an elector."

This enjoins upon the judges of election the especial duty of challenging, but does not arrogate to them the sole right to challenge. It has been the custom in this State for any elector to challenge when he believes the person offering to vote is not entitled to vote.

The constitution, the highest law in this State, disqualifies a member of any order from voting who encourages, advises, teaches, counsels, or aids polygamy, plural or celestial marriage, or teaches that any rule of action or law is greater than the laws of this State in matters of civil conduct. The membership of an organization which does these things prohibits anyone from holding any civil office or from voting. The election laws prescribe what questions shall be asked the person offering to vote who is challenged upon certain ground, viz: First. Upon the ground that he is not a citizen. Second. That he has not resided in the precinct, county, or State a sufficient length of time to vote. In no other case does it prescribe what questions shall be asked. To hold that one can not challenge a polygamist or anyone who teaches, advises, or counsels members in the organization that does believe in polygamy, or who places the ecclesiastical above the civil law, is erroneous and contrary to sections 2 and 3 of Article VI of the constitution. Such claim is absurd, and the threat to arrest a person who challenges others offering to vote is not sound in law nor fair to our constitution, upon which rests the entire superstructure of our young Commonwealth. The right to challenge is the privilege accorded by the law above mentioned, and is not an offense. It may be exercised, it should be exercised, to the end that anyone not a qualified elector should be prevented from voting. The election law in Idaho (Session Laws 1899, p. 34, sec. 5) especially provides that—

"Electors are privileged from arrest except for treason, felony, or breach of the peace during their attendance on election."

Our advice to challengers in Idaho is that you challenge any person who offers to vote in your precinct when you believe such person is not entitled to vote under the provision of our constitution, as well as of statute, but in doing so we advise you to act in a peaceable, dignified, and determined manner, without disturbing the peace; that you state the grounds of challenge and ask that the person be sworn and questioned in regard to his constitutional right to vote.

I hope that the higher citizenship may guide all challengers in the performance of this very important function. The good citizens of this State should rally to the support of those who are adding to insist upon the adherence to this provision of our State constitution, which was placed there by the leading citizens of Idaho, regardless of party affiliations, and which affords such a splendid safeguard to our people, if enforced.

I remain, with great respect,

H. W. LOCKHART,

Chairman Democratic State Central Committee.

BOISE, IDAHO, November 1, 1906.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, the chairman of the Republican State committee also issued an address to the voters and election judges, in which he advised them in regard to their duty. He said:

ELECTION JUDGES TAKE NOTICE!

An organized attempt has been threatened to prevent thousands of citizens who are duly qualified and registered voters from casting their ballot.

It is your sworn duty to see that qualified electors have an opportunity to cast their ballots without molestation or interference of any kind.

The election laws of Idaho regarding the duties of the judges of election are plain and simple. By an act of the legislature you are furnished by the county clerk with the election laws of the State, which is your only guide in the performance of your duties. When you go beyond this law you interfere with the rights of citizens of the State, and you violate the laws you have sworn to uphold, and you are amenable to the law governing such cases.

It is your sworn duty to keep all persons out of the room where the election is being conducted, except persons who are authorized to vote and the proper election officers. You are empowered to remove all other persons, and it is your duty to do so, and especially such persons as interfere in any manner with the voters.

If you should allow any person to be present for the purpose of challenging, it is your duty to see that it is done in good faith and that such challenge must not result in intimidation or interfering with voters or delaying the voters from casting their ballots.

No one except the judges should be permitted in any manner to interrogate a voter after he is challenged. The challenger can not ask him any questions. It is your duty, if you believe the challenge is made in good faith and upon any of the grounds mentioned in the election laws furnished you, to state the qualifications of an elector to the person challenged, and if the person challenged declares himself qualified and the challenge is not withdrawn, then you should administer to him the elector's oath as provided in the election laws, and you are prohibited from administering any other oath, and he is not compelled to take any other oath in order to be allowed to vote.

Then the chairman of the Republican State committee says:

The elector's oath prescribed by the statute, and which is the only oath that you can administer, is found on page 17 of the election laws, and is as follows:

ELECTOR'S OATH.

"I do swear (or affirm) that I am a citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years, or will be the _____ day of _____, A. D. 1900— (naming the date of next succeeding election); that I have (or will have) actually resided in this State for six months and in this county for thirty days next preceding the next ensuing election; that I have never been convicted of treason, felony, embezzlement of public funds, bartering or selling or offering to barter or sell my vote, or purchasing or offering to purchase the vote of another, or other infamous crime, without thereafter being restored to the rights of citizenship; that I will not commit any act in violation of the provisions in this oath contained; that I am not now registered or entitled to vote at any other place in this State; that I do regard the Constitution of the United States and the laws thereof, and the constitution of this State and the laws thereof, as interpreted by the courts as the supreme law of the land; (when made before a judge of election as: 'and I have not previously voted at this election') so help me God."

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ A. D. 1900. Register of _____ precinct, _____ county, Idaho."

I will say in regard to the elector's oath that it does not prescribe one of the qualifications which are in our constitution. Every one of them which affects a Mormon is carefully eliminated by the legislature from the elector's oath. The chairman of the Republican State committee says:

The elector's oath prescribed by the statute * * * is the only oath that you can administer.

And then the chairman of the Republican State committee says:

The grounds of the challenge must be stated by the challenger, and a challenge can not be made except for the following reasons, to wit:

- That the person has been convicted of a felony;
- Or that the person has not resided in the State six months;
- Or that the person has not resided in the precinct thirty days;
- Or that the person is not a citizen of the United States or is not 21 years of age;
- That the person is registered and entitled to vote in some other place in the State;
- That the person has previously voted at this election.

If the challenge is made on the ground that a person has been convicted of a felony, he shall not be questioned by anyone, not even the judges, but the laws you are furnished with provide the proof to be produced in order to prevent him from voting.

If the challenge is made on any of the other four grounds mentioned, the law provides what questions shall be asked by the judges, and when this is done your full duty and authority is performed.

When a voter is registered the law makes the registration *prima facie* evidence of his right to vote, and he should be allowed to cast his ballot unless it is shown to you that he is disqualified under the law, and you are furnished with the law pertaining to your duties and what the qualifications of the legal voter are.

Any attempt to challenge voters on account of their being members of churches or organizations or associations, or on account of their religious or other beliefs, is illegal and is an intimidation of voters, and it is your sworn duty to see that this is not done.

JAMES H. BRADY,
Chairman Republican State Committee.

BOISE, IDAHO, October 13, 1906.

In these instructions to judges and Mormons every one of the disqualifications in our constitution is left out.

Governor Gooding, in a speech at Rexburg just before the election—I will say that the vote at Rexburg on election day was 644 for Gooding and 66 for Stockslager, 644 to 66—Governor Gooding, in this Mormon precinct, said: "Arrest these challengers if they interfere or intimidate you. I will stand by you as governor of the State if you arrest them." And the Weiser World, the known organ of Governor Gooding, had this to say on November 2:

To citizens of Idaho:

Carry arms on election day in sections where it may be necessary to defend the rights of citizens, and use such means to protect the ballot as the occasion may demand.

They followed the advice. We sent our challengers to the polls, and the Mormons arrested at Rexburg and threw into jail Mr. H. A. Buchman, who was running for sheriff on the American ticket, and J. A. Kinney, a druggist from St. Anthony. They were there to put the constitutional challenge to Mormons,

as they had the right to do under the statutes of Idaho. They were arrested by the Mormons and thrown into jail and deprived of their right to vote. Will Mulkins and Robert Hopkins, as reputable citizens as there are anywhere, were thrown into jail at Sugar City. The vote there stood, Gooding 422, Stockslager 27. They were thrown into jail for intimidating 422 votes against 27!

Down in Bannock County, at McCammon, H. O. Harkness, one of the most reputable citizens of Idaho, who has been a leading character there for thirty years, a lifelong Republican, was arrested for challenging Mormon voters. He was there and helped to make the State. He was one of the pioneers. He is one of the leading characters of the State. He was arrested by a Mormon constable and taken 25 miles to Pocatello.

Our challenger was arrested at Oxford, also in Bannock County. One hundred and five men were challenged there, and the judges refused to administer the constitutional oath. Gray, the Mormon county attorney of the county of Bannock, telephoned to arrest the challenger and throw him in the ditch, and they arrested him. At no place would the Mormons take the constitutional oath. They refused. At Rose precinct, in my county and near my town, a Mormon named Johnson, whose brother has just been elected to the legislature from Bingham County (he is a Mormon bishop), threatened to arrest the judges of election at Rose, two of whom were Gentiles, and prevented them as judges from challenging the voters. It was that way all through this southeastern country. There were fights in some precincts—that is, the great masses of the Mormons would throw out the Gentiles; and in no case did the Mormons take the constitutional requirement.

The Mormons elected twenty-seven members of the legislature in Idaho out of a total of seventy-two. They absolutely elected by force of numbers in those counties twenty-one members. Their votes elected six more. Out of these twenty-one whom they absolutely control they elected sixteen Mormon bishops. They allowed the Gentiles to have, I think, three members of the legislature in southeastern Idaho, but they were careful that they were as subservient to the church as a Mormon bishop would be.

The result of the election—and the whole fight was, as I say, made on the Mormon question, from one end of the State to the other, and from the beginning to the end—was that Governor Gooding carried the six Mormon counties in south Idaho out of the sixteen, and none other. He lost the ten Gentile counties, although all but three of them are strongly Republican. He carried, two years ago, Canyon County, where Governor Steunenberg lived and died and is revered. It is a purely agricultural county, and Governor Gooding carried it two years ago by 1,200. This time he lost it by 600.

Ada County, in which Boise City is situated, which is normally Republican by 2,500, and which Governor Gooding carried two years ago by 3,000, he lost by over 500 this time. It is a purely agricultural county. He lost the Republican counties—every one of them—in south Idaho. He carried three counties out of five in the north by a slight majority. So in the State outside of the Mormon counties he carried three counties only.

Judge Stockslager came to the Mormon belt with a majority of between two and three thousand, which these six Mormon counties wiped out, and planted to the credit of Governor Gooding 8,800 majority. The people of Idaho intended to elect last time a Democratic governor and a Democratic legislature, and they would have elected a Democratic legislature, but that the Socialist vote defeated it. The Democrats were beaten in the county of my colleague, Shoshone County, by 200 as respects their legislative ticket. The Socialist vote was 700 in the county. The Socialist vote added to the Democratic vote would have made a Democratic legislature.

The Democratic party was not making a campaign for the Socialist ticket. The Republicans were encouraging the Socialists to keep up their organization, and in the midst of it President Roosevelt sent Secretary Taft to Idaho to speak in behalf of law and order and for Governor Gooding, who was advising the Mormons to mob American citizens who were attempting to exercise the right of challenge at the polls.

I will submit the official vote of the State, prepared by the secretary of state, which, if anyone is curious to read it, will show that if the Socialists are against law and order, they were the adjuncts of the Republican party; and I trust that the President of the United States does not mean that every member of a labor union is against law and order, because, as I say, these overwhelmingly Republican counties went for Judge Stockslager on the Mormon question, and they were agricultural counties, without a mine in them.

Abstract of votes cast for governor and members of the Idaho State legislature for 1904 and 1906.

County.	1904.					1906.						
	Frank R. Gooding, Rep.	Henry Heitfeld, Dem.	Theo. D. Shaw, Soc.	Edwin R. Headley, Pro.	T. W. Bartley, Peop.	Frank R. Gooding, Rep.	Chas. O. Stockslager, Dem.	Thos. F. Keller, Soc.	Silas Luttrell, Pro.	William Majors, Ind.	Noah Pitts, Ind.	Fred T. Dubois.
Ada.....	4,007	1,984	271	157	21	2,600	3,116	266	203
Bannock.....	2,778	1,014	219	2	2	2,373	1,421	128	8
Bear Lake.....	1,615	349	14	3	2	1,915	209	19	1
Bingham.....	3,035	1,004	341	25	10	2,994	1,411	266	33
Blaine.....	916	1,154	74	10	2	997	1,056	111	18
Boise.....	907	794	102	36	15	601	981	125	9
Canyon.....	2,671	1,412	302	191	34	2,146	2,750	251	180	1
Cassia.....	1,032	468	55	4	7	1,478	1,164	159	26
Custer.....	399	575	25	3	1	294	743	39	4
Elmore.....	452	584	56	10	4	404	754	124	7
Fremont.....	3,332	1,111	314	8	8	4,841	1,223	596	22	1
Idaho.....	2,195	1,925	242	27	16	1,750	1,760	188	27
Kootenai.....	3,555	1,776	555	122	12	2,917	2,858	686	108
Latah.....	2,616	1,620	205	162	13	2,696	1,268	252	194
Lemhi.....	690	659	21	5	10	655	787	15	4
Lincoln.....	644	342	26	2	691	764	156	5
Nez Percés.....	3,099	2,714	379	155	8	2,953	2,097	439	135
Oneida.....	2,276	830	73	2,892	355	79	15	1
Owyhee.....	536	558	77	6	5	356	665	82	3
Shoshone.....	2,987	2,048	44	26	4	1,997	2,162	445	16
Washington.....	1,535	1,301	206	36	5	906	1,922	233	19
Total.....	41,878	24,252	4,000	990	179	38,386	29,496	4,650	1,087	1	1	1

Abstract of votes cast for State senators and representatives at the general election held November 8, 1904.

ADA COUNTY.	
Senators:	
John W. Walker, Republican.....	4,100
Samuel H. Hays, Democrat.....	1,821
Robert L. Creek, Socialist.....	285
Representatives:	
Orren V. Allen, Republican.....	4,054
Harvey B. Powers, Republican.....	4,077
James H. Richards, Republican.....	4,112
Erwin W. Johnson, Republican.....	3,890
Marion S. Parker, Democrat.....	2,017
John B. Wilburn, Democrat.....	1,813
Theodore E. Laing, Democrat.....	1,874
William T. Booth, Democrat.....	1,915
Robert E. Knapp, Socialist.....	267
George F. Carter, Socialist.....	275
Fletcher F. Lovejoy, Socialist.....	265
Robert L. Pennell, Socialist.....	270
BANNOCK COUNTY.	
Senators:	
John J. Hull, Republican.....	2,443
Thomas H. Grassford, Democrat.....	1,341
William Liddell, Socialist.....	195
Representatives:	
Norman Belcher, Republican.....	2,371
John Schutt, Republican.....	2,388
J. Frank Hunt, Republican.....	2,327
William A. Holzheimer, Democrat.....	1,487
Charles W. Fryar, Democrat.....	1,384
Benjamin W. Henderson, Democrat.....	1,434
Frank D. Brown, Socialist.....	200
J. E. Trimmings, Socialist.....	205
Frank Gibson, Socialist.....	210
BEAR LAKE COUNTY.	
Senators:	
William L. Rich, Republican.....	1,311
Joseph C. Rich, Democrat.....	1,035
Representatives:	
Grove C. Gray, Republican.....	1,365
Wilford W. Richards, Republican.....	1,415
George C. Hillier, Democrat.....	980
Christian Wallantine, Democrat.....	876
BINGHAM COUNTY.	
Senators:	
James E. Steele, Republican.....	2,762
George Chapin, Democrat.....	1,277
A. K. Brundage, Socialist.....	337
Representatives:	
Fred H. Turner, Republican.....	3,070
L. J. Porter, Republican.....	3,010
Alfred Chistensen, Republican.....	2,946
J. G. Hinkle, Democrat.....	976
A. A. Dewey, Democrat.....	955
L. M. Capps, Democrat.....	1,006
F. S. Fry, Socialist.....	336
Bingham Matthews, Socialist.....	356
Henry H. Trowbridge, Socialist.....	344
BLAINE COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Fred W. Hastings, Republican.....	1,119
George A. Williams, Democrat.....	968
Representatives:	
Sidney C. Fuld, Republican.....	1,149
Daniel D. Bush, Republican.....	1,138
Archibald Billingsley, Democrat.....	928
Charles H. Porter, Democrat.....	1,014

BOISE COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Walter F. Hiatt, Republican.....	1,027
John O. Barbon, Democrat.....	725
Representatives:	
Frederick S. Logan, Republican.....	955
Augustus F. Walters, Democrat.....	789
CANYON COUNTY.	
Senators:	
William M. Wayman, Republican.....	2,731
W. W. Snell, Democrat.....	1,480
Alvah J. Hand, Socialist.....	304
R. E. Haynes, Independent.....	1
Representatives:	
Daniel W. Ainey, Republican.....	2,806
Gilbert T. Hamill, Republican.....	2,860
Arthur A. Richards, Republican.....	2,860
C. W. Whiffin, Democrat.....	1,424
W. A. Sample, Democrat.....	1,363
E. W. Patison, Democrat.....	1,390
Henry Reimes, Socialist.....	301
Willie E. Snodgrass, Socialist.....	301
John V. Wheeler, jr., Socialist.....	301
CASSIA COUNTY.	
Senators:	
George A. Day, Republican.....	933
Dan T. Albee, Democrat.....	603
Representatives:	
Louis H. Sweetser, Republican.....	1,001
Richard K. Lessey, Democrat.....	513
CUSTER COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Charles F. Baker, Republican.....	453
Ravenel Macbeth, Democrat.....	516
Representatives:	
George L. Morgan, Republican.....	506
Joshua D. Woods, Democrat.....	424
ELMORE COUNTY.	
Senators:	
John P. Clays, Republican.....	511
William A. Russell, Democrat.....	539
Representatives:	
Thomas W. Rickford, Republican.....	505
Robert D. Gorby, Democrat.....	559
FREMONT COUNTY.	
Senators:	
John W. Hart, Republican.....	3,652
Alma C. Hess, Democrat.....	1,411
Charles H. Cammans, Socialist.....	304
Representatives:	
Charles C. Moore, Republican.....	3,672
William N. Stephens, Republican.....	3,496
Olney D. Bell, Republican.....	3,461
James O. Webster, Republican.....	3,515
George E. Hill, jr., Democrat.....	1,447
Joseph L. Larsen, Democrat.....	1,590
A. D. Miller, jr., Democrat.....	1,634
T. B. Ellsworth, Democrat.....	1,546
H. B. Adams, Socialist.....	293
L. Roseborough, Socialist.....	202
J. W. Kooch, Socialist.....	285
J. F. Shoemaker, Socialist.....	1
IDAHO COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Charles H. Nugent, Republican.....	2,394
Martin L. Butler, Democrat.....	1,714
Wesley Chapman, Socialist.....	48
Representatives:	
Gustavus J. Wright, Republican.....	2,425
William D. Timm, Republican.....	2,469
J. Loyal Atkinson, Republican.....	2,392
Benjamin D. Knorr, Democrat.....	1,827
George L. Hedges, Democrat.....	1,657
Matt Fuchs, Democrat.....	1,651
Henry T. Smith, Socialist.....	38
William V. Manning, Socialist.....	41
Henry Lyons, Socialist.....	1
KOOTENAI COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Herman H. Taylor, Republican.....	3,535
Simon P. Donnelly, Democrat.....	1,810
James C. Schurlock, Socialist.....	555
Thomas Turnbull, Independent.....	1
Representatives:	
William Ashley, jr., Republican.....	3,504
A. A. Sage, Republican.....	3,442
J. H. Spaulding, Republican.....	3,215
Charles O. Callahan, Democrat.....	1,800
S. H. Watkins, Democrat.....	1,775
A. A. Darknell, Democrat.....	2,064
J. Rand Sanborn, Socialist.....	586
Amos C. Smith, Socialist.....	557
David E. Biglow, Socialist.....	555
LATAH COUNTY.	
Senators:	
Maris E. Lewis, Republican.....	2,773
William H. Harris, Democrat.....	1,412
Adge M. Holdale, Socialist.....	228
Representatives:	
James J. Mulalley, Republican.....	2,876
James S. Nelson, Republican.....	2,614
Samuel M. Smith, Republican.....	2,723
Henry H. Bangs, Democrat.....	1,357
William M. Thompson, Democrat.....	1,648
Frank E. Mix, Democrat.....	1,404
Almarine A. Anderson, Socialist.....	228
Tennis E. Miller, Socialist.....	231
Melvin C. Davis, Socialist.....	227

LEMMING COUNTY.

Senators:	
Robert W. McBride, Republican	711
William T. Stethem, Democrat	691
Representatives:	
Lorenzo Falls, Republican	669
Orin E. Kirkpatrick, Democrat	721

LINCOLN COUNTY.

Senators:	
Joseph S. Darrach, Republican	640
James P. Stevenson, Democrat	353
Representatives:	
Samuel J. Donaldson, Republican	658
John H. Condit, Democrat	326

NEZ PERCES COUNTY.

Senators:	
George E. Crum, Republican	3,509
William S. Rice, Democrat	2,054
Representatives:	
Charles D. Thomas, Republican	3,376
Len McGill, Republican	3,383
Jacob L. Goodnight, Republican	3,462
Wyckliffe R. Smith, Republican	3,312
Eben Mounce, Democrat	2,248
Frank E. Fogg, Democrat	2,183
J. Shannon Hogue, Democrat	2,081
Daniel Green, Democrat	2,197
Kiney G. Osterhout, Socialist	397
Victor H. Fitzgerald, Socialist	392
William H. Buncy, Socialist	392
Joseph N. Hanks, Prohibitionist	158
Edward Dowling, Prohibitionist	162
Alveny Rickle, Prohibitionist	156
Clarence Talbot, Prohibitionist	161
Ira P. Holcomb, Independent	4

ONEIDA COUNTY.

Senators:	
Henry Jones, Republican	1,794
David L. Evans, Democrat	1,435
Representatives:	
Wilford Bennion, Republican	1,828
Denmark Jensen, Republican	1,811
George Foster, Republican	1,807
Lewis Williams, Democrat	1,425
Stephen Collan, Democrat	1,438
John A. Kofoed, Democrat	1,342

OWYHEE COUNTY.

Senators:	
John Lamb, Republican	620
Redmond J. Hanlon, Democrat	524
Representatives:	
Harry Avery, Republican	574
Milton E. Reynolds, Democrat	544

SHOSHONE COUNTY.

Senators:	
Alfred Page, Republican	2,582
Charles Helm, Democrat	2,295
John W. Vincent, Socialist	496
Representatives:	
Rufus J. Anderson, Republican	2,778
Hugh France, Republican	2,659
Adam Aulbach, Republican	2,858
Alexander D. McKinlay, Republican	2,663
Leon O. Whitsell, Democrat	2,228
Andrew M. Roberts, Democrat	2,217
Moses S. Sommons, Democrat	2,048
Admon R. Oxley, Democrat	2,093
John M. Hughes, Socialist	463
Emil Krause, Socialist	457
Theodore Krugman, Socialist	450
Ludwig Kampf, Socialist	446

WASHINGTON COUNTY.

Senators:	
Leander W. Smith, Republican	1,599
Thomas C. Galloway, Democrat	1,247
Fred A. Wilkie, Socialist	217
Representatives:	
Lester P. Smith, Republican	1,603
William McBratney, Republican	1,603
Archibald Hudelson, Democrat	1,211
C. Howard Denison, Democrat	1,233
Festus Foster, Socialist	211
Milam R. Morris, Socialist	204

Abstract of votes cast for State senators and representatives at the general election held November 6, 1906.

ADA COUNTY.

Senators:	
John McMillan, Republican	3,264
Fletcher H. Lovejoy, Socialist	332
Erwin W. Johnson, Citizen	1,188
Homer G. Patterson, Prohibition	343
FRED DEBOIS, Independent	3
W. E. Borah, Independent	1
Jonas Brown, Independent	1
Milton Sebern, Independent	1
Representatives:	
Chas. C. Cavanah, Republican	3,322
Frank T. Wyman, Republican	3,395
D. D. Shaw, Republican	3,297
Arch Cunningham, Republican	3,372
Willard White, Republican	3,323
I. Wilson Wright, Socialist	334
Chas. M. Abbott, Socialist	335
Clemson Underwood, Socialist	344
Robert L. Creek, Socialist	335
E. Francis Atwater, Socialist	332
Roland H. Robb, Prohibitionist	281
William A. Lawrence, Prohibitionist	287
Horatio A. Swartz, Prohibitionist	282
Samuel B. Taylor, Prohibitionist	289
James A. Casebeer, Prohibitionist	300

Representatives—Continued.

Ralph P. Quarles, Citizen	1,387
William R. Butler, Citizen	1,262
Marion S. Parker, Citizen	1,376
John H. Ross, Citizen	1,264
E. B. Matthews, Citizen	1,220
John Daly, sr., Independent	1

BANNOCK COUNTY.

Senators:	
E. E. Jacobs, Republican	2,461
D. Worth Clark, Democrat	1,282
William Liddell, Socialist	140
Representatives:	
J. Frank Hunt, Republican	2,368
W. H. Lovesey, Republican	2,407
W. A. Staley, Republican	2,429
Joseph B. Bistline, Democrat	1,376
Timothy M. Farrell, Democrat	1,331
Charles W. Fryar, Democrat	1,287
Claud C. Smith, Socialist	145
Dennis J. O'Mahoney, Socialist	143
Robert George, Socialist	145

BEAR LAKE COUNTY.

Senators:	
William L. Rich, Republican	1,348
E. F. Guyon, Democrat	81
William H. Ridd, Socialist	1
Joseph O. McCart, Prohibitionist	1
Joseph C. Rich, Citizen	778
FRED T. DEBOIS, Independent	1
Representatives:	
James Redman, Republican	1,411
John H. Grimmer, Republican	1,407
Joseph McCart, Democrat	83
B. F. Fitzpatrick, Democrat	83
Christian Wallantime, Citizen	667
Fred L. Crinkshank, Citizen	704
E. F. Guyon, Independent	1
McMillen, Independent	1

BINGHAM COUNTY.

Senators:	
Otis E. McCutcheon, Republican	2,626
S. J. Rich, Democrat	744
Frank E. Wierman, Socialist	259
John G. Brown, American	1,049
D. Worth Clark, Independent	1
Representatives:	
Peter G. Johnston, Republican	2,686
Robert M. McCracken, Republican	2,677
Christian Anderson, Republican	2,628
Ed. Holden, Democrat	700
W. W. Adamson, Democrat	723
John C. Rushton, Democrat	744
Joseph Vance, Socialist	260
C. W. Nelson, Socialist	270
John A. Modin, Socialist	294
Andrew Burkman, American	1,044
John W. Jones, American	1,074
Ralph Edmunds, American	874

BLAINE COUNTY.

Senators:	
Reginald F. Buller, Republican	1,092
James W. Ballantine, Democrat	974
Representatives:	
Thomas C. Stanford, Republican	1,012
James L. Baxter, Republican	921
Charles H. Porter, Democrat	1,004
George A. McLeod, Democrat	1,193

BOISE COUNTY.

Senators:	
F. V. Tinker, Republican	716
L. R. Walters, Democrat	888
Representatives:	
F. S. Logue, Republican	771
G. W. Barry, Democrat	832

CANYON COUNTY.

Senators:	
Arthur A. Richards, Republican	2,424
G. W. Lamson, Democrat	2,271
Frank Fouch, Socialist	284
James H. Egbert, Prohibitionist	157
Representatives:	
George F. Zimmerman, Republican	2,362
Samuel Ballantyne, Republican	2,397
L. V. Patch, Republican	2,348
C. W. Whiffn, Democrat	2,418
Eugene J. Deane, Democrat	2,377
J. L. Sewell, Democrat	2,461
Daniel D. Besse, Socialist	266
Gustave Schaffhausen, Socialist	266
Robert D. McKee, Socialist	268
J. D. Bird, Prohibitionist	130

CASSIA COUNTY.

Senators:	
Geo. A. Day, Republican	1,489
John Janney, Democrat	1,125
Sam T. Shell, Socialist	164
Representatives:	
Harry T. West, Republican	1,583
Orville L. Beecher, Democrat	1,016
J. E. Barnhurst, Socialist	168

CUSTER COUNTY.

Senators:	
Chas. F. Baker, Republican	361
Ravenel Macbeth, Democrat	724
Representatives:	
Leslie E. Dillingham, Republican	347
Nathan H. Clark, Democrat	719

ELMORE COUNTY.

Senators:	
Henry O. Manz, Republican	588
Robert D. Gorby, Democrat	525
Ralph W. Simpkins, Socialist	145
Representatives:	
William Pickrell, Republican	493
L. J. Weaver, Democrat	579
Henry Crab, Socialist	166

FREMONT COUNTY.

Senators:	
John W. Hart, Republican	5,014
C. H. Moon, American	401
A. M. Slatery, Socialist	633
Geo. S. Young, Citizen	3
Fred T. Dubois, Independent	3
Representatives:	
James E. Fogg, Republican	4,897
Ell M. Harris, Republican	4,777
John D. Killpack, Jr., Republican	4,880
James W. Webster, Republican	4,802
Wesley Gibson, Citizen	336
Jesse M. Baker, Citizen	424
Joseph Kroker, Socialist	598
E. S. Mathias, Socialist	653
C. H. Cammons, Socialist	582
L. J. Maurer, Socialist	25
A. C. Langley, American	482
O. H. Olive, American	459
N. N. Burggraf, American	456
G. Reimann, American	466
Hoggan, Independent	1
W. L. Flint, Independent	8
Goody, Independent	1
Alfred Ricks, Independent	6
Geo. Hjort, Independent	1
William Pettit, Independent	1
Henry Fisher, Independent	1

IDAHO COUNTY.

Senators:	
Chas. H. Nugent, Republican	1,788
Geo. Simon, Democrat	1,734
Representatives:	
Enoch W. Whitcomb, Republican	1,712
Fred G. Painter, Republican	1,679
William A. Jones, Republican	1,500
William S. M. Williams, Democrat	1,858
James Surridge, Democrat	1,884
John A. Cassell, Democrat	1,894

KOOTENAI COUNTY.

Senators:	
Ignatz Well, Republican	2,889
J. S. McClellan, Democrat	2,941
William S. Sommers, Socialist	657
Representatives:	
J. P. Fallon, Republican	2,967
* William L. Gleason, Republican	2,931
Jacob C. Finstad, Republican	2,929
S. D. Taylor, Republican	2,964
W. B. Hagar, Democrat	2,815
Arthur A. Darknell, Democrat	2,835
Earl S. Prindle, Democrat	2,814
Chas. E. Riggs, Democrat	2,809
Amos C. Smith, Socialist	673
Jay Rand Sanborn, Socialist	677
David E. Bigelow, Socialist	670
Harry Atwater, Socialist	670

LATAH COUNTY.

Senators:	
Warren Truitt, Republican	2,128
Tennis E. Miller, Socialist	218
J. C. Carrick, Prohibitionist	196
Jerome J. Day, Citizen	1,737
Representatives:	
James J. Mulalley, Republican	2,293
Martin J. Wessels, Republican	2,296
Benjamin J. Jones, Republican	2,161
John Anderson, Socialist	219
Nathew Miller, Socialist	216
Robert I. Hutchison, Socialist	215
William M. Duthie, Prohibitionist	219
Colden B. Sanders, Prohibitionist	196
Henry A. Morgan, Prohibitionist	224
John Lorang, Citizen	1,565
Samuel Knepper, Citizen	1,466
Thos. H. Christie, Citizen	1,495

LEMHI COUNTY.

Senators:	
M. M. McPherson, Republican	728
William C. Whitwell, Democrat	739
Representatives:	
Alexander D. Guy, Republican	679
James L. Kirtley, Jr., Democrat	767

LINCOLN COUNTY.

Senators:	
William Van Iorns, Republican	810
Henry A. Secor, Democrat	592
B. R. Shimp, Socialist	169
Representatives:	
Asa A. Abbott, Republican	727
Hardy Sears, Democrat	662
R. L. Cheney, Socialist	173

NEZ PERCES COUNTY.

Senators:	
Elmer Waldrip, Republican	2,614
Marnar D. Mills, Democrat	2,318
John T. Lough, Socialist	434
Edwin F. Beaudreau, Prohibitionist	152

Representatives:

L. G. Bradley, Republican	2,597
Wickliffe R. Smith, Republican	2,605
Charles C. Miles, Republican	2,615
Seneber S. Brooks, Republican	2,624
Ole A. Anderson, Republican	2,646
Eben Mounce, Democrat	2,284
Ernest L. Parker, Democrat	2,257
John J. Wood, Democrat	2,295
Frank Gaffney, Democrat	2,233
Nathaniel G. Looney, Democrat	2,184
Nichalaous Jacobs, Socialist	460
Alfred White, Socialist	452
Kinney Ousterhout, Socialist	456
Representatives--Continued.	
John J. Senter, Socialist	451
Thomas M. Marek, Socialist	452
Clarence E. Talbott, Prohibitionist	145
James L. Pearson, Prohibitionist	153
Emory Smith, Prohibitionist	139
John C. Carlson, Prohibitionist	142
Joseph M. Hawks, Prohibitionist	142

ONEIDA COUNTY.

Senators:	
Denmark Jensen, Republican	2,004
Otto Gassman, Independent	1,254
Phillip J. Evens, Socialist	99
William W. Evens, Independent	24
Representatives:	
Wilfred Bennion, Republican	1,845
L. D. Jones, Republican	1,965
Lewis Williams, Democrat	1,404
Hugh S. Geddis, Democrat	1,215
David O. Wilcox, Socialist	72
S. L. Pierson, Socialist	70
W. T. Oliver, Independent	25
James S. Frew, Independent	24

OWYHEE COUNTY.

Senators:	
Edwin Herrington, Republican	476
Arthur Pence, Democrat	516
Robert E. Morrow, Socialist	99
Representatives:	
John E. Keith, Republican	505
Michael Downs, Democrat	487
Nathanial G. Massey, Socialist	88

SHOSHONE COUNTY.

Senators:	
Ewen McIntosh, Republican	2,076
Edward H. Moffitt, Democrat	1,805
David C. Cates, Socialist	612
Representatives:	
Albert H. Conner, Republican	2,219
Thos. R. Jones, Republican	2,219
Hernam J. Rossi, Republican	2,012
Abner G. Kerns, Democrat	1,879
Hans M. Thostenson, Democrat	1,788
Chas. Heim, Democrat	1,864
Peter O. Swanson, Socialist	524
Dani. C. Hudson, Socialist	515
Geo. L. Cloud, Socialist	506

WASHINGTON COUNTY.

Senators:	
Lot L. Feltham, Republican	1,177
Edward A. Van Sicklin, Democrat	1,630
J. H. Morrison, Socialist	235
Representatives:	
F. E. Brown, Republican	1,264
P. H. Miller, Republican	1,135
Albert L. Freehafer, Democrat	1,718
Archibald B. Hudelson, Democrat	1,518
S. A. Keithley, Socialist	212
H. H. Cossitt, Socialist	216

The Socialist vote would have elected the member in Canyon County. There were two Democratic members elected out of four in Canyon County. It went twelve hundred Republican two years ago, and, as I say, it is the place where Governor Steunenberg lived and died. They elected half of the Democratic legislative ticket there, and they beat the district judge who was sitting in this case.

There is nothing in the law-and-order case, except that a self-confessed murderer named Orchard testified, I think, that he stood with his rifle leveled on ex-Governor Steunenberg as he sat by his window, surrounded by his family, during the Christmas holidays. He did not shoot, because he feared the pane of glass might deflect the ball. He waited, and put dynamite between the gateposts, knowing the habits of ex-Governor Steunenberg, and as the ex-governor was going to his home at Christmas time, in the dusk of evening, he struck the string, the bomb exploded, and tore him to pieces. The man who testified to this says that three members of a great organization employed him to do it.

The Idaho authorities had these men arrested in Colorado and taken to Idaho. Friends of these men endeavored to get them out on a writ of habeas corpus. The courts of Idaho passed on the case, there being on the bench, among others, our candidate for governor, Chief Justice Stockslager. They denied the writ of habeas corpus. It came here to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was pending during our election. It was decided only a few days ago in accordance with the decision

of the courts of Idaho. And out of that they tried to make the President of the United States and others believe that there was a law-and-order issue in Idaho, as if any citizen of Idaho does not want to see the murderers of ex-Governor Steunenberg executed—Orchard or the other men or anybody else. It was not mentioned in the campaign by anyone, unless it was by Governor Gooding, and then in a way designed not to alarm the labor vote.

I will read a letter from Mr. Buchman, who was thrown into jail at Rexburg. It is from St. Anthony, Fremont County, Idaho, a Gentile town:

Senator FRED T. DUBOIS,
Washington, D. C.

Immediately after election a number of prominent Mormons, among them Mr. James Fogg, the bishop of this ward, called on the merchants of this place and demanded from them that I be dismissed from office as chief of police because I went to Rexburg and challenged voters.

The majority of the merchants refused to take this action against me. Mr. —, the leading merchant here—

Mr. Buchman gives his name, but I will not mention it, because the Mormons would drive him out of town. They would boycott this merchant if I read his name. So I will not give his name:

Mr. —, the leading merchant here (and one of them whom the bishop had been to see demanding my discharge), came to me and offered to pay my salary to the end of my term in office, or six months, amounting to \$450 cash, in full if I would hand in my resignation to the city council. Mr. — remarked that it was strictly a matter of business with him, as they (the Mormons) had threatened to boycott his store unless he used his efforts with other merchants to gain my discharge.

I am a Republican, yet I have been appointed chief of police by two Democratic as well as two Republican mayors, and I received the largest vote of any candidate on any ticket in my own precinct for sheriff this last election on the American ticket.

Respectfully,

H. A. BUCHMAN.

Mr. Sam Rich, a leading Mormon of my county, who was running for the State senate, went into the Mormon counties and appealed to them to boycott everyone who was supporting the American ticket. They said they would do it. Those are the conditions which confront our American citizens in that section of the country, and the governor proclaims to men who cast votes 175 to nothing, as they did in many precincts, to see that they are not intimidated by a challenger; that if a challenger comes along to arrest him.

You naturally wonder why we do not seek redress in the courts. You can not get it in southeastern Idaho any more than you can get it in Utah. There is not a beneficiary of the Mormon political power that will not make some excuse and some apology for this state of affairs, but not one of them will stand for effective legislation.

In Utah there is a Republican-Mormon party and a Democratic-Mormon party, both equally controlled by the Mormon hierarchy. The American party in Utah is composed of Gentiles, both Republicans and Democrats, who are battling there, under the very shadow of this tremendous ecclesiastical power, for American citizenship, for the separation of church and state, and against the degradation of womanhood and home. It is a noble, magnificent contest they are making.

They have abandoned all hope of political preferment and suffer financially in their unequal struggle for American principles. President Roosevelt throws the weight of his mighty influence against the Americans and for the Republican-Mormons in Utah led by President Smith and Senator SMOOT. He demands in Utah an indorsement of Smith and SMOOT.

The Mutual Improvement Era is the organ of the Mutual Improvement Association of the Mormon Church, and these associations comprise practically all membership of the church ranging between the years of 16 and 35. Joseph F. Smith is the editor. Anything emanating from him in his capacity as editor is considered to be the word of the Lord to the Mormons. His instruction through the Mutual Improvement Era is assumed by him and by all the zealots in his following to be the commandment from the Most High. While he does not name the Republican ticket and the Republican organization as being the special objects of his regard, such specific designation in words is unnecessary, because his following is so tutored as to understand what he means, and every Republican priest who desired to do so could utilize this article and place the intended interpretation upon it. Furthermore, it was ample notice to every Democratic priest to waive his partisanship and assist the Republican cause.

I will read an article of November 2, 1906, just before election, signed by Joseph F. Smith:

[Improvement Era, November, 1906.]

At no time have the leaders of this people counseled evil, and it is true that where individuals have heeded the counsels of the church such persons have in the end succeeded best and have recognized the wisdom and justice of their counsels. The contrary course has universally ended in failure, often in spiritual death and moral degrada-

tion, while the fruits of obedience through their counsels are prosperity, spiritual life, moral purity, advancement, contentment, and joy. Now, these are facts. These have been the fruits of "Mormonism" and the results of following the counsels of the church authority. Why, then, should any young man, or old either, when malicious falsehood is hurled recklessly at the devoted leaders, doubt their integrity or disregard their advice? Has not history proved the servants of the Lord to be honest, just, secure in the right, and their counsels safe guides through the way, ending in ultimate blessing?

Just now there is a tendency among some of the thoughtless young men to join in or sympathize with the fight against the church authority waged by the assassins of virtue, the supporters of vice and riot, and wine and lewd women, gambling, robbery, and general corruption. It is a senseless tendency, and they who follow it will do so to their own destruction.

At the present time we are about to make a choice of some political leaders. It is scarcely necessary to say that a man who has the interest of himself and his people at heart will choose his friends. Who are our friends? Men who have kept informed on the trend of affairs in the nation for the past two years or more may easily surmise. To vote any other way would be ungracious, against our own best interests, and would show a spirit of ungratefulness such as this people do not naturally possess. "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them."

JOSEPH F. SMITH.

Here is a letter from one Musser. It is written by A. Milton Musser, a lifelong devotee of the hierarchy, a polygamist, an employee in the Church Historian office. He would not have dared to commit one sentence of this communication to the public print except by permission of the chief hierarchy. Musser claims to be a Democrat and is appealing to Mormon Democrats.

PLAIN FACTS ABOUT THE TWO GREAT POLITICAL PARTIES.

To whom it most concerns:

President Theodore Roosevelt and his Administration are fair to "Mormons" in common with all other citizens. Federal appointments in this State were made in the face of violent opposition from anti-"Mormon" parties, the anti-"Mormon" party. The appointments made by the President show that in such matters he listens exclusively to the Congressional delegation from the State.

The proposition to put in its platform a plank reflecting adversely on the "Mormons" was rejected emphatically by the last Republican national convention—that of 1904, at Chicago—while the same proposition was accepted by the last Democratic national convention—that of 1904, at St. Louis—the anti-"Mormon" plank as presented by FRED T. DUBOIS at that time being incorporated into the Democratic national platform.

The Republican leaders in Congress, on the recommendation of Senator REED SMOOT, struck out of the Arizona-New Mexico statehood law the amendment of Democratic Senator DUBOIS, which was intended to disfranchise the "Mormons" in that State.

The Republican leaders in Congress, on the recommendation of Senator GEORGE SUTHERLAND, struck out of the new immigration law the clause placed there at the instigation of Democratic Senator DUBOIS, by which "Mormon" immigrants were to be excluded from the United States on the ground of belief in polygamy.

The Republican party leaders prevented the consideration and passage by Congress this year—1906—of an amendment to the National Constitution framed by Democratic Senator DUBOIS and intended to disfranchise the "Mormons" in the United States.

The minority report of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, which report is a complete vindication of the "Mormon" people on the issues raised in the SMOOT case, is signed exclusively by Republicans, the signers being among the strongest, brainiest, and most influential members of the United States Senate. The majority report of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections in the REED SMOOT case, which report is an assault upon the citizenship of all "Mormons," is signed by every Democratic member of that committee. This case became practically a party question, with the real force and strength of the Democratic party nationally lined up on the side of depriving "Mormons" of their rights as citizens, while the real force and strength of the Republican party nationally is lined up on the side of maintaining the rights of "Mormons" as citizens. Democratic success in Utah means the strengthening of the Democratic line-up against "Mormons," and the weakening—possibly the breaking up—of the Republican line-up in defense of the rights of "Mormons" as citizens.

The Republican party, having control in the nation, having the National Administration, the United States Senate, and the House of Representatives, has the power (and the inclination and courage to use it) to protect "Mormons" in their rights as citizens, which power, if alienated or directed into other channels as advocated by Democratic leaders, would prove most disastrous to the "Mormon" people.

The Democratic party in Idaho, being an integral part of the national Democratic party and therefore of necessity in accord with its general party policy, is openly and actively contending for the disfranchisement of the "Mormon" people, while the Republican party, and therefore of necessity in accord with its general party policy, is openly and actively contending for equal rights to "Mormon" citizens in the face of an extensive anti-"Mormon" prejudice. The most prominent feature of the present political campaign in Idaho is the warfare which the Democratic party is waging against the "Mormon" people and the fight which the Republican party is putting up there on behalf of "Mormons" being protected in their rights as citizens.

The Democratic party organ in Utah—the Salt Lake Herald—has declared in favor of the election of the Democratic State ticket and Democratic Senator DUBOIS in Idaho; these are all pledged to the disfranchisement of the "Mormon" people. This is not surprising, since the party organ must be with the general party policy, and the protest of any small section of that party that it does not agree with such policy is not only futile, but is misleading.

The Republican party in Utah, at its last State convention, gave a decided rebuke to efforts to inject into the State platform a criticism of "Mormons" exercising full political privileges, while the Democratic party in Utah, at its last State convention, committed itself to the virtual disfranchisement of a portion of the "Mormon" people, by declaring against "Mormons" who may hold church positions exercising their constitutional rights to the full privileges of citizenship. The Democratic State platform there adopted applies a religious test to "Mormons" for office in violation of the National Constitution and gives direct encouragement to the fight of the Democracy in Idaho for the disfranchisement of "Mormons."

So far as it has been able the Republican party nationally, by its control of legislation in Congress, by its Chicago platform, and by the voice and action of all its strong Representatives on the United States Committee on Privileges and Elections, has declared in favor of the "Mormon" people retaining and exercising the full rights of citizens in common with other people in this nation; the Republican party in Idaho, being an integral part of the national Republican party, is in accord therewith, and is now leading the fight for preserving the rights of the "Mormon" people; the Republican party is in harmony therewith, and is outspoken in upholding the rights of "Mormons" in common with those of all other citizens. On the other hand, so far as it has been able, the Democratic party nationally, by its St. Louis convention platform, by the unanimous vote of its Senators on the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and by the efforts of its leaders in Congress to disfranchise the "Mormons" in Arizona and New Mexico and to exclude "Mormons" from entering the United States as immigrants, has declared against the "Mormon" people; the Democracy in Idaho, being a part of the national Democratic party and in accord therewith, is leading the fight against the "Mormon" people; the Democracy in Utah, an inseparable part of the national Democratic party and in harmony therewith, so far as it has ventured to express itself, has not dared to utter a word in protest against the attack of the Democratic party elsewhere on the rights of the "Mormon" people, but so far as its utterances have gone these are in line of encouraging and abetting that attack on the "Mormons."

Will any "Mormon" who heretofore has voted the Democratic ticket do so again in the face of these stubborn facts, which are so plain and positive that no sane man can be blind thereto? Can any "Mormon" who heretofore has supported the Republican ticket be cajoled, threatened, or beguiled into voting the Democratic ticket or any part thereof at this time, in view of the hostile attitude of the Democratic party toward the "Mormon" people?

It is an incontrovertible fact, already demonstrated well beyond the possibility of doubt—no matter how much boasting, sputtering, protesting, and deception may be engaged in to the contrary—that so far as the "Mormon" people are concerned the Democratic party has abandoned whatever high principles it once had and has become the party of intolerant, selfish, cruel, relentless religious persecution, and is a violator of the National Constitution in so far as that great charter of human liberty guarantees freedom to worship God to all citizens, "Mormons" or otherwise, and to exercise the full rights of citizenship now enjoyed. And, further, the policy now being followed by the Democratic party toward the "Mormon" people is a rank and inexcusable betrayal of every trust reposed in the party by any "Mormon" who ever voted a Democratic ticket. By its treachery to the "Mormon" voters, who have honored and trusted it so oft, the Democratic party merits the enmity and execration of every "Mormon" and of every lover of human liberty, political or religious.

Summed up, the facts show conclusively that the Republican party throughout the whole nation is united in defending the rights of the Mormon people as citizens. On the other hand, they also show that the Democratic party throughout the whole nation, with perhaps the exception of the Democrats in Utah, is antagonistic to and arrayed against the Mormon people. In fact, there is no difference in that respect between the so-called "American" party and the Democratic party. Even in Utah, while the Democratic party has not declared for the wholesale disfranchisement of the Mormon people, it has declared practically for the disfranchisement of a certain class of Mormons.

It can be shown conclusively that not only is the Republican party stronger in this State than the Democratic party, but it is also stronger in Salt Lake County, and consequently all good citizens, irrespective of party, should vote the Republican ticket to overthrow the "American" party.

Conservative Democrats readily admit that there are very few of their class left in the Democratic ranks; they also admit that there are now more Gentiles in the Republican party than in the Democratic party.

In the last city election R. P. Morris, the Democratic nominee for mayor, ran considerably ahead of the ticket, and received a large number of Republican votes. The Democratic councilmanic ticket was ahead of the Republican only about 412 votes. This year it is a county election. About one-third of the vote is outside of Salt Lake City. In the last county election, with the "American" ticket in the field, Congressman HOWELL had 1,616 votes in excess of O. W. Powers. It is conceded that the article appearing in the Deseret News the night before election drove Gentile Republicans into the "American" ranks and "Mormon" Republicans into voting the Democratic ticket. The last election returns show that the Republican party, while in the county outside of the city, it is over 1,600 votes ahead.

I have been a life-long Democrat, but for the foregoing reasons I will not give further support to the political party which has shown so much unjust discrimination and bitter enmity toward an unoffending and patriotic people.

A. MILTON MUSER.

This is signed by A. Milton Muser, and published in the Inter-mountain Republican, a paper which is understood at any rate to be the official organ of the senior Senator from Utah, and it would not have been published, as I have stated, unless with the advice and consent of Joseph F. Smith.

The following resolution, referred to by Mr. Muser, was presented to the Republican State convention September 21, 1906:

Be it further resolved, That the Republican party of the State of Utah hereby declares and affirms that it is opposed to the union of church and state, and that it is unalterably opposed to any high ecclesiast of any denomination whatsoever seeking and asking for political preferment and benefit of civil office, or unduly interfering with politics while he is holding any high ecclesiastical or church position, and for the future, and in order to promote tranquillity, perfect equality, and the best possible progress of the State, the Republican party will use its endeavors to enforce and maintain this principle.

That was offered by a young Mormon, and they immediately asked him when he had apostatized; how long he had been out of the church. They did not even give the poor young Mormon the privilege of allowing the resolution to be voted on. They simply smothered it out with ridicule.

That was the situation of affairs in Utah and in Idaho, as I have tried to convey it.

In Idaho the Republican party is allied with the Mormons. The vote of the State is divided about as follows:

Republicans	28,000
Mormons	17,000
Democrats	18,000
Socialists	5,000
Prohibitionists	2,000
Total	70,000

The Democratic party is making its fight in Idaho against the domination of the polygamous Mormon hierarchy in the politics of the State.

In southeastern Idaho, where the Mormons are in absolute control, there are American county tickets, the same as in Utah, composed of Republican and Democratic Gentiles. It is an unequal fight. The Mormons absolutely dominate the Republican party and elect its ticket. President Roosevelt sent Secretary of War Taft to Idaho to aid the Mormon nominee for governor and to say to the Gentile Republicans of Idaho that the Administration desires the election of the Republican-Mormon ticket.

ASSOCIATED PRESS ACCOUNT OF TAFT GOING WEST.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 22, 1906.

It was announced to-day that Secretary Taft would speak in Representative WACHTER'S district in Baltimore next Friday night, and that according to a programme arranged jointly by Representative SHERMAN, of the Congressional committee, Senator DICK, of Ohio State committee, and Representative BURTON, of Cleveland, he will speak at Cleveland Saturday, in Mr. BURTON'S district, and at Lancaster and Logan, Ohio, on Monday next.

It has not yet been determined whether he will deliver an address in Speaker CANNON'S district or at Omaha, but he will speak in Idaho in the interest of Governor Gooding on the subject of "law and order."

This was October 22, 1906, and I immediately wired the President the following:

Press dispatches say you are sending Secretary Taft to Boise, Idaho, to speak for Governor Gooding, in behalf of law and order, and on account of the character of the campaign being made against him. If this is true, you are entirely misinformed. No law and order campaign is being waged in Idaho.

The sole issue is against the domination of the Mormon Church in our politics.

I assure you that you have been misinformed and that it will be understood that Secretary Taft will be sent here to speak in behalf of Mormonism, as that is the sole issue in the Idaho campaign.

The announcement that Secretary Taft was to come brought joy to the hearts of every polygamist in Utah and Idaho. It may not make any difference to the President of the United States, but it does to me, that every minister in Idaho, without exception—Methodist, Presbyterian, Catholic, Episcopalian—supported our contention. Republican ministers everywhere appeared on the platform and introduced me to the audiences. They are familiar with the conditions there, they know what they are, and every Christian minister—I defy them to name a single exception in Idaho—supported the Democratic party in their last campaign. It may not appeal to President Roosevelt, but for me I would sooner have their support and that of the good women of this land in this fight for principle than to have the support of this polygamous hierarchy.

One million and more petitions came here to this Senate asking that the apostle Senator from Utah be denied his seat. Do you think those good women did not know what they were doing? Who pass for you your child-labor laws, your juvenile-court laws? Who look after your hospitals? Who keep pure the home, the foundation on which this Republic can rest only with security? Were it not for the good women of this land we would wander far from the right. It is through their exertions that all this legislation which makes us an enlightened nation comes to pass. They knew what they were doing. They have their missionaries in Utah and Idaho and Wyoming and that part of the country all the time. They get reports from them every month. They know what are the conditions there, and they appeal to you to help the womanhood of the country and the childhood of the country.

It may make no difference to President Roosevelt that he has lost the respect and support of these great women organizations. He may not care, because he has this great political asset which can return six Senators and soon can return ten to this body. I received this letter, which I will read, signed by high officers of these great women organizations of the country:

DEAR SIR: The women of the country recognize the right to religious liberty, which is a fundamental principle of our Government, but they are fully justified in their claim that the Mormon hierarchy is a polygamous, commercial, and political organization that, because of its cloak of religion, received protection for its unlawful acts.

The desire to secure the solid vote of the Mormons, which Joseph F. Smith can promise to whom he will, has caused the investigation into REED SMOOT'S right to a seat in the Senate to drag on for three years, because in that time Presidential and Congressional elections have been held. It has been a bitter sorrow and disappointment to the women to learn that the terrible conditions revealed in Utah and adjoining States sink into insignificance when a political party needs the Mormon vote. Has the time come when the great Republican party,

the party of moral issues, the party formed to free the country of polygamy and the union of church and state, will condone these offenses and support those who are responsible for them?

The investigation has proved to any unbiased individual that to-day in Utah, Idaho, and other States there exists in intensified degree a condition of polygamy and union of church and state which, when Utah was a Territory, caused the President and the Congress to confiscate the property of the Mormon Church and deprive them of the franchise.

Leaders of the women's national organizations have traveled extensively through Utah, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington during the last year, and have heard the claim of the Mormon leaders that President Roosevelt is their friend. And in the last election in Utah a letter was written by Elder A. Milton Musser, historian of the Mormon Church, printed and distributed to every Mormon voter, citing instances to prove the friendship and support of the Republican party for the Mormons and ordering them to vote the Republican ticket; also the inclosed advice from President Joseph F. Smith as to how Mormons should vote.

Last May representatives of women's organizations, numbering in their constituency 10,000,000 women, met at the New Willard, in Washington, and unanimously adopted resolutions urging the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections to report on the Smoot case before the closing of the session. They also called on the President at the White House and placed in his hands a copy of the resolution, assuring him that the women of the country, realizing his interest in the sanctity of the home, believed he would aid in destroying this enemy of the home, the wife, and the mother.

Women in Utah and in Idaho who were standing for the protection of their homes, for the protection of their children, and for the freedom from the weight and thralldom of this un-American power, were, with the women of the nation, dismayed when, by the order of the Chief Executive, Secretary Taft visited Idaho just previous to the election in support of the Republican party, which is dominated in these States by the Mormon hierarchy.

The majority of the women enlisted in this battle for the honor of womanhood, for the legitimacy of childhood, and for freedom, purity, and honor, have been lifelong Republicans, and it is with the grief and shame that a mother feels when a loved child goes wrong that the women of the nation note the attitude of those from whom they had expected help and guidance, but who have wandered far from the principles of Lincoln and Grant in condoning the crimes of the Mormon hierarchy and upholding one of its highest officials as a Senator of the United States.

All honor to the brave men who have placed principle above party, and who by either vote or influence have refused to perpetuate the greatest crime of the century.

To them and to God the people must look for relief from the terrible wrongs to womanhood, to childhood, and to the moral tone of the whole community, which would fill volumes if they were printed.

EXECUTIVE BOARD,
League of Women's National Organizations.
MRS. FREDERIC SCHOOF, *Chairman.*
MRS. MARGARET DYE ELLIS, *Secretary.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 10, 1906.

I appeal to you, brother Senators, as representatives of American States, to aid us in the continuation of the struggle for American institutions in these States of the American Union. The burden, the hardship, falls on us who live amidst these conditions, as it always has and always must. We ask you not to allow the apostle Senator from Utah to retain a seat in this great body of lawmakers for an enlightened nation. Should you do so and thus vote your approval of Mormonism and your condemnation of our efforts, you will make the fight the harder for us and for them. We think we are entitled to your earnest support. If you will not give this, we demand as our right that the President of the United States cease allowing the power of his great name and office to be invoked and made use of against our efforts.

Mormon domination and American Commonwealths can not exist together under our system of government. One or the other must be destroyed. The American States will survive in our mountain country, and no President or party, however, great or powerful, can make them long continue subservient to priestly rule.

In closing, I warn the Republican party not to reenact the darkest page of its history when they undertook to place the negro in control in the South. It has resulted in a solid white South against you. If you attempt to put in control of the American citizenship of the Rocky Mountain States this Mormon hierarchy you will find your support narrowed in the future to the followers of the Mormon hierarchy. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

During the delivery of Mr. DUBOIS's speech,

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 5133) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

After the conclusion of Mr. DUBOIS's speech,

KONGO FREE STATE.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the pamphlet which I send to the desk may be printed as a Senate document. It is the report of the debate in the Belgian House of Representatives in regard to the Kongo, and contains a great many very interesting matters.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire to have it referred?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I desire merely to have it printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being until Monday, December 17, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1906.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

George B. Cortelyou, of New York, now Postmaster-General, to be Secretary of the Treasury, to take effect March 4, 1907, vice Leslie M. Shaw.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

James Rudolph Garfield, of Ohio, now Commissioner of Corporations in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to be Secretary of the Interior, to take effect March 4, 1907, vice Ethan A. Hitchcock.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

George v. L. Meyer, of Massachusetts, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, to be Postmaster-General, to take effect March 4, 1907, vice George B. Cortelyou, nominated to be Secretary of the Treasury.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Benjamin H. Barrows, of Nebraska, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Omaha, in the State of Nebraska. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Lock McDaniel, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, commencing January 16, 1907, in the place of Marcus C. McLemore, resigned, to take effect at the close of January 15, 1907.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE.

John T. De Bolt, of Hawaii, to be first judge of the circuit court of the first circuit of the Territory of Hawaii. A reappointment, his term expiring January 13, 1907.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Thomas Ives Chatfield, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, commencing January 1, 1907, in the place of Edward B. Thomas, whose resignation will take effect at the close of December 31, 1906.

MEMBERS, MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. William T. Rossell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member of the Mississippi River Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the improvement of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Lieut. Col. James L. Lusk, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relieved.

Maj. James G. Warren, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Maj. Thomas L. Casey, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relieved.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Roger D. Black, Corps of Engineers, from September 17, 1906, vice Wigmore, promoted.

Second Lieut. Theodore H. Dillon, Corps of Engineers, from September 26, 1906, vice Putnam, promoted.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Daniel M. Taylor, Ordnance Department, from November 12, 1906, vice Pitman, retired from active service.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Charles H. Clark, Ordnance Department, from November 12, 1906, vice Taylor, promoted.

To be major.

Capt. Kenneth Morton, Ordnance Department, from November 12, 1906, vice Clark, promoted.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be majors.

Capt. Guy Carleton, Thirteenth Cavalry, from October 2, 1906, vice Edwards, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Thomas B. Dugan, Twelfth Cavalry, from October 28, 1906, vice Willcox, Fourth Cavalry, retired from active service.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be captain.

First Lieut. Louis S. Chappellear, Artillery Corps, from November 26, 1906, vice Farrar, detailed as quartermaster.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. William E. Murray, Artillery Corps, from November 26, 1906, vice Chappellear, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Edwin B. Bolton, Tenth Infantry, from December 2, 1906, vice Macklin, Fourth Infantry, retired from active service.

To be lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Henry B. Moon, Tenth Infantry, from December 2, 1906, vice Bolton, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

To be majors.

Capt. Benjamin W. Atkinson, Sixth Infantry, from October 20, 1906, vice Rogers, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Benjamin M. Purcell, detailed paymaster, from October 30, 1906, vice Young, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Fielder M. M. Beall, Third Infantry, from October 31, 1906, vice Bullard, Twenty-eighth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Maury Nichols, Third Infantry, from December 2, 1906, vice Moon, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Robert E. Frith, Twenty-ninth Infantry, from July 28, 1906, vice Davis, Seventeenth Infantry, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. Samuel T. Ansell, Eleventh Infantry, from August 7, 1906, vice Walker, Eighth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Robert H. Peck, Twenty-fourth Infantry, from August 7, 1906, vice Perkins, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Halsey E. Yates, Fifth Infantry, from August 15, 1906, vice Ely, Twenty-ninth Infantry, detailed as paymaster.

First Lieut. Clement A. Trott, Fifth Infantry, from August 20, 1906, vice Burnham, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Wilson B. Burt, Fifth Infantry, from September 11, 1906, vice Arrasmith, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Walter S. Brown, Tenth Infantry, from September 12, 1906, vice Glidden, Twenty-fifth Infantry, resigned.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 23, 1904, I nominate Col. James E. Macklin, United States Army, retired, to be placed on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of brigadier-general from December 2, 1906.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 23, 1904, I nominate Col. George P. Borden, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be placed on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of brigadier-general from the date on which he shall be retired from active service.

I nominate the following-named officers on the retired list of the Navy to be advanced from the 29th day of June, 1906, to the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by them at the time of their retirement, as indicated, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved June 29, 1906.

Assistant engineers with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) to be passed assistant engineers with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) on the retired list.

Henry D. Sellman,
Alexander H. Price,
Joseph S. Greene,
Daniel A. Sawyer,

James W. Patterson,
James G. Littig,
William G. McEwan,
William H. Platt, and
George C. Drinen.

Col. Robert L. Meade, of the Marine Corps, to be a brigadier-general on the retired list of officers of the Marine Corps, from the 29th day of June, 1906, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved on that date.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Midshipman Francis J. Cleary to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1905, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 30, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

John W. Magee to be postmaster at Chico, in the county of Butte and State of California, in place of John W. Magee. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1906.

Stanley Morehead to be postmaster at San Rafael, in the county of Marin and State of California, in place of William N. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1906.

Walter Mundell to be postmaster at Sawtelle, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of Walter H. Metcalf, resigned.

COLORADO.

R. Lincoln Pence to be postmaster at Ault, in the county of Weld and State of Colorado. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

INDIANA.

John Sharp to be postmaster at Frankton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, in place of Howard C. Daugherty. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1906.

IOWA.

Le Roy E. Cox to be postmaster at Belle Plaine, in the county of Benton and State of Iowa, in place of Le Roy E. Cox. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

Gustavus F. Peek to be postmaster at Algona, in the county of Kussuth and State of Iowa, in place of Gustavus F. Peek. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

Charles H. Smith to be postmaster at Marshalltown, in the county of Marshall and State of Iowa, in place of John Q. Saint. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1906.

KANSAS.

Jennie R. Reed to be postmaster at Almena, in the county of Norton and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

MAINE.

Joshua W. Black to be postmaster at Searsport, in the county of Waldo and State of Maine. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

Lewis C. Flagg to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of York and State of Maine, in place of Lewis C. Flagg. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1906.

MICHIGAN.

Everett N. Clark to be postmaster at Wyandotte, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, in place of Everett N. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1906.

Orrin T. Hoover to be postmaster at Chelsea, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan, in place of Orrin T. Hoover. Incumbent's commission expires December 15, 1906.

Milo N. Johnson to be postmaster at Northville, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, in place of Milo N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1906.

Charles H. Pulver to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Monroe and State of Michigan, in place of Charles H. Pulver. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1906.

NEBRASKA.

O. K. Paddock to be postmaster at South Omaha, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska, in place of Frederick J. Etter, deceased.

Alfred H. Thomas to be postmaster at Trenton, in the county of Hitchcock and State of Nebraska. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

NEW YORK.

Frank B. Barnard to be postmaster at Dunkirk, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, in place of Frank B. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

Adolph Bluestone to be postmaster at Canaseraga, in the county of Allegany and State of New York, in place of Adolph Bluestone. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

Samuel R. Riley to be postmaster at Bronxville, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in place of Anna V. T. Smith, resigned.

Frederick R. Smith to be postmaster at Norwood, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York, in place of Frederick R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1906.

Selah H. Van Duzer to be postmaster at Horseheads, in the county of Chemung and State of New York, in place of Selah H. Van Duzer. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1906.

Edward Williams to be postmaster at Granville, in the county of Washington and State of New York, in place of John G. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1907.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. Wersler Thomson to be postmaster at Phoenixville, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in place of J. Wersler Thomson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1906.

RHODE ISLAND.

Jonathan Bateman to be postmaster at Manville, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, in place of Jonathan Bateman. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1906.

Arthur W. Stedman to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island, in place of Arthur W. Stedman. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

VERMONT.

Georgia E. Lewis to be postmaster at North Troy, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont. Office became Presidential October 1, 1906.

WASHINGTON.

Alexander Jolley to be postmaster at Elma, in the county of Chehalis and State of Washington, in place of Alexander Jolley. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1906.

WYOMING.

William Rogers to be postmaster at Green River, in the county of Sweetwater and State of Wyoming, in place of Willis F. Hoadley, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1906.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

John Avery McIlhenny, of Louisiana, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

William B. Ridgely, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS.

Edgar E. Clark, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term ending December 31, 1912.

Judson C. Clements, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of seven years from January 1, 1907.

James S. Harlan, of Illinois, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term ending December 31, 1911.

MARSHAL.

Eugene L. Lewis, of Ohio, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Charles R. Skinner, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

CONSULS.

Hilary S. Brunot, of Pennsylvania, lately consul of class 8 at St. Etienne, to be consul of the United States of class 8 at Jerez de la Frontera, Spain.

William H. Hunt, of New York, lately consul of class 8 at Tamatave, to be consul of the United States of class 8 at St. Etienne, France.

Felix S. S. Johnson, of New Jersey, lately consul of class 8 at Puerto Cortes, to be consul of the United States of class 8 at Bergen, Norway.

Augustus G. Seyfert, of Pennsylvania, lately consul of class 8 at Matamoros, to be consul of the United States of class 8 at Collingwood, Ontario, Canada.

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frank F. Patterson, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs for the port of Camden, N. J., in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Clarence C. Pusey, of Maryland, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at Baltimore, Md.

DEPUTY AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

James B. Belt, of Maryland, to be Deputy Auditor for the Interior Department.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS.

Civil Engineer Harry H. Rousseau, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 5th day of January, 1907.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

James J. Donovan, of Michigan, to be register of the land office at Marquette, Mich.

Henry S. Chubb, of Florida, to be register of the land office at Gainesville, Fla., by transfer from receiver of public moneys at Gainesville.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

John H. Knapp, a citizen of Missouri, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 5th day of December, 1906 (subject to the physical examination required by law).

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Franklin J. Drake, on the active list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy from the 10th day of December, 1906, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved June 29, 1906.

Lieut. Commander John A. Dougherty to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1906.

Lieut. Commander John B. Bernadou, an additional number in grade, to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1906, with Lieut. Commander John A. Dougherty, promoted.

Lieut. Walter S. Crosley, an additional number in grade, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1906, with Lieut. Edward H. Campbell, promoted.

Surg. George P. Lumsden to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 6th day of September, 1906.

Commander Albert Mertz to be a captain in the Navy from the 2d day of November, 1906.

Lieut. James F. Carter to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1906.

Lieut. David Van H. Allen to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 10th day of October, 1906.

Asst. Surg. Winfield S. Pugh to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1906, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 12th day of October, 1906, upon the completion of three years' service in their present grade:

Elwin C. Taylor.

Franklin E. Campbell.

James E. Gill.

Isaac S. K. Reeves.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

The following-named officers on the retired list of the Marine Corps to be advanced from the 29th day of June, 1906, to the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by them at the time of their retirement, as indicated, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved June 29, 1906:

Col. William S. Muse, United States Marine Corps, to be a brigadier-general on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Majs. Augustus S. Nicholson and Erastus R. Robinson, United States Marine Corps, to be lieutenant-colonels on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Cpts. Frederick H. Corrie, Frank D. Webster, and Archibald S. Taylor, United States Marine Corps, to be majors on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

Second Lieut. Edward R. Miller, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant on the retired list of the Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Edward Hall to be postmaster at Stuttgart, in the county of Arkansas and State of Arkansas.

COLORADO.

Wesley A. Martin to be postmaster at Mancos, in the county of Montezuma and State of Colorado.

Daniel W. Stone to be postmaster at Trinidad, in the county of Las Animas and State of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT.

Frank M. Buckland to be postmaster at West Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

James Graham to be postmaster at Taftville, in the county of New London and State of Connecticut.

Bradley S. Keith to be postmaster at Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Charles W. Munsinger to be postmaster at Coscob, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

FLORIDA.

Louis C. Lynch to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

IDAHO.

Julia Connors to be postmaster at Mullan, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho.

Fred Evans to be postmaster at Burke, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho.

W. H. Greenhow to be postmaster at Twin Falls, in the county of Cassia and State of Idaho.

ILLINOIS.

James O. Burton to be postmaster at Dahlgren, in the county of Hamilton and State of Illinois.

James S. Courtright to be postmaster at Normal, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

Charles S. Randolph to be postmaster at Ipava, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

John C. Fudge to be postmaster at Dunkirk, in the county of Jay and State of Indiana.

William H. Gostlin to be postmaster at Hammond, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Omer Guyton to be postmaster at Cambridge City, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana.

Winfield S. Keith to be postmaster at Bicknell, in the county of Knox and State of Indiana.

Andrew Morrissey to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

William E. Netherton to be postmaster at Winamac, in the county of Pulaski and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

W. H. Harrison to be postmaster at Poteau, District 14, Ind. T.

IOWA.

John W. Burns to be postmaster at Keosauqua, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa.

James C. Dinwiddie to be postmaster at Marengo, in the county of Iowa and State of Iowa.

S. G. Goldthwaite to be postmaster at Boone, in the county of Boone and State of Iowa.

Walter F. Hall to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa.

C. E. Haverly to be postmaster at Ames, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

A. F. Morse to be postmaster at Newell, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

Sherman F. Myers to be postmaster at Anita, in the county of Cass and State of Iowa.

Robert B. Oldham to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Adair and State of Iowa.

Malcolm Peterson to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

Minnie A. Phoenix to be postmaster at Ruthven, in the county of Palo Alto and State of Iowa.

William G. Ray to be postmaster at Grinnell, in the county of Poweshiek and State of Iowa.

Adelbert J. Weeks to be postmaster at Correctionville, in the county of Woodbury and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

Jacob B. Callen to be postmaster at Junction City, in the county of Geary and State of Kansas.

Herbert Caveness to be postmaster at Chanute, in the county of Neosho and State of Kansas.

MAINE.

Edward Brown to be postmaster at Thomaston, in the county of Knox and State of Maine.

Samuel F. Davis to be postmaster at South Paris, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine.

Frank L. Field to be postmaster at Belfast, in the county of Waldo and State of Maine.

William M. Stuart to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

Abraham L. Wallace to be postmaster at Millbridge, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Althamer E. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Holliston, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Elbridge Nash to be postmaster at South Weymouth, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

David D. Streeter to be postmaster at Mount Hermon, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

James W. Bedell to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan.

Margaret Duncan to be postmaster at Au Sable, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

Josephus C. Mustard to be postmaster at Scottville, in the county of Mason and State of Michigan.

C. Guy Perry to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Leonard M. Sellers to be postmaster at Cedar Springs, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

William D. Hale to be postmaster at Minneapolis, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota.

Frank H. Kratka to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, in the county of Red Lake and State of Minnesota.

A. O. Lea to be postmaster at New Richland, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Andrew J. Seibert to be postmaster at Ste. Genevieve, in the county of Ste. Genevieve and State of Missouri.

NEBRASKA.

Frank McCartney to be postmaster at Nebraska City, in the county of Otoe and State of Nebraska.

William A. Price to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska.

Edward B. Richardson to be postmaster at Ulysses, in the county of Butler and State of Nebraska.

NEW YORK.

George D. Genung to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Tioga and State of New York.

James M. Pitkin to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Wayne and State of New York.

Minnie N. Slaughter to be postmaster at Tottenville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

Eugene Vreeland to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Yates and State of New York.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Chris Fuoter to be postmaster at Ray, in the county of Williams and State of North Dakota.

OKLAHOMA.

George Y. Walbright to be postmaster at Stroud, in the county of Lincoln and Territory of Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James C. Jacobs to be postmaster at Burnham, in the county of Mifflin and State of Pennsylvania.

George W. McCauslin to be postmaster at Narberth, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Nora L. Pickering to be postmaster at Peckville, in the county of Lackawanna and State of Pennsylvania.

VIRGINIA.

Annie G. Davenport to be postmaster at Gordonsville, in the county of Orange and State of Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

George E. Work to be postmaster at Sistersville, in the county of Tyler and State of West Virginia.

RECIPROCAL PROTECTION OF PATENTS WITH GUATEMALA.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 13, 1906, from a convention between the United States and the Republic of Guatemala for the reciprocal protection of patents, signed at Guatemala city on November 10, 1906.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 13, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. ERNEST M. POLLARD.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska offers the following resolution as a matter of privilege. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on July 18, 1905, ERNEST M. POLLARD was elected to fill the vacancy in the Fifty-ninth Congress caused by the resignation of Hon. E. J. BURKETT; and

Whereas the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives paid

ERNEST M. POLLARD for the period intervening between March 4, 1905, the beginning of the Fifty-ninth Congress, and July 18, 1905, the date of his election thereto; and

Whereas Mr. POLLARD's legal right to receive pay for this period has been questioned and his action in accepting it has been severely criticised by certain parties; and

Whereas section 51 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, under which payment was made, has never been construed by the courts in a case exactly like this: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That this whole matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House with instructions to investigate the legal questions involved and report its conclusions to this House before the termination of the present Congress.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF LUMBER.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up resolution No. 652, and ask unanimous consent for that privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 652.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and is hereby, requested to investigate the cause of the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture, and the said investigation shall be conducted with the particular object of ascertaining whether or not these high prices have resulted in whole or in part from any contract, agreement, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign countries; also whether the said prices have been manipulated in whole or in part by any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, and if so, to investigate the organization, capitalization, profits, conduct and management of the business of such corporations, companies, or corporate combinations, and make early report of his findings according to law.

To carry out and give effect to the provisions of the resolution the Secretary shall have power to issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive depositions taken before any proper officers in any State in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands this is a request to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the resolution and to consider it in the House at this time. Is there objection?

Mr. DE ARMOND. What resolution is that?

The SPEAKER. The resolution which has just been read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? I do not object to the consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there is no objection to the consideration. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to know what provision is made in the resolution to pay the expenses of this investigation, or whether there is a fund provided by law for the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to pay the expense of having this investigation made? In other words, it would be useless to pass a resolution directing the investigation to be made, witnesses to be summoned, and testimony taken if money is not provided for it. I did not hear read any provision in the resolution providing money for the investigation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, if I get it correctly, there is no question about the fund to carry out this investigation, and the House, I think, is exceedingly anxious that an investigation of this kind should be made, at least the country is, and we are exceedingly anxious to get it passed just as soon as possible so that this investigation may be commenced.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit me to say, I do not object to it. I am as much in favor of an investigation as anyone, and I hope the resolution will be passed. The gentleman misunderstands me. He thinks I am opposing the resolution and I am not. I am merely suggesting to the gentleman that in undertaking to provide for the investigation there ought to be means provided for the purpose of doing it completely. You remember the President returned a like resolution in respect to the oil investigation and the coal investigation to the House with the suggestion they had not provided funds for the purpose of carrying on the investigation, and if this resolution needs such an amendment providing for a fund I think the gentleman ought to provide for it, and for one I will vote for it.

Mr. MILLER. As far as the question of money for the purpose of carrying out the investigation is concerned, if they have not a sufficient fund on hand it will be immediately provided for by an appropriation, and I think the gentleman will agree

heartily with me, as far as the subject-matter is concerned, that it ought to be passed, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I caught the reading of the resolution it applies only to manufacturers of lumber. Now, I think it should read so as to cover the wholesale and retail dealers also, and if in the first case it does not include them it should be amended so as to include wholesale and retail dealers as well as manufacturers.

Mr. MILLER. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the whole field will be covered by the language of this resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would like to have the resolution read again.

Mr. MILLER. It is the question of the high price of lumber through all the stages of its production, and it is sufficiently broad to cover that entire question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not believe that the language is broad enough to cover the wholesalers and retailers.

Mr. MILLER. I want to say to the gentleman that this resolution was referred by the Judiciary Committee to the Department of Commerce and Labor for its views upon the subject, and they have reported back to that committee.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Has the gentleman any objection to amending the resolution?

Mr. MILLER. I would have no objection to that; no. But I think it is sufficiently broad to include all dealers in lumber.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I ask that for this reason, that many of the mill owners state that the price of lumber has not been raised by them, but that it has been raised entirely by the wholesale dealer and the retail dealer. If they are the guilty ones, we ought to amend the resolution. I ask that the resolution be read again.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman have any objection to amending his resolution so as to ascertain whether or no the present high price of lumber is due in any degree to the present very high prices that the Government is demanding for stumpage of its timber on the forest reserves?

Mr. MILLER. I will answer that question, Mr. Speaker, and I will say again that in my judgment the resolution is broad enough to cover that whole question.

Mr. GILBERT and Mr. HEPBURN rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] yield?

Mr. MILLER. To the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that his resolution only refers to the manufacture of lumber in its various stages; that it will have no application whatever to the dealer, either wholesale or retail, after it leaves the manufacturer's hands, and it is the contention on the part of dealers, at least, that the high price of lumber is owing to combinations among the manufacturers, while they in turn say that it results from these combinations among the dealers. Now, it seems to me the resolution ought to be modified. This resolution was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. I suppose that they failed to report it because they recognized the fact that it was not a subject properly before them. If it had been sent to the proper committee, it would have been reported upon long ago and in proper shape.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa I desire to state that the Committee on the Judiciary has not reported this resolution for the reason that they have not been able to hold a meeting of that committee for the purpose of considering this question, and I am informed now by a member of that committee, the chairman of it, that the probabilities are they will not have another meeting until after the holidays. That is why I asked this morning for unanimous consent to call up this resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be read.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Clerk read the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] wish the resolution to be read in his time?

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will let the resolution be read in his time.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution the second time.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, if the gentleman will yield a minute, I want to suggest that we add, after the words "various stages of manufacture," the words "purchase and sale," and then you will cover the points which have been raised.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to accept that amendment—that,

after the word "manufacture," in line 3, page 1, the words "and sale" be inserted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "manufacture," insert the words "and sale."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on page 2, as I find upon examination of the law on the subject that they are not necessary. The Secretary now has ample power under the law as it exists.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2 strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Has unanimous consent been given for present consideration?

The SPEAKER. It has.

Mr. MANN. Then I would like a moment's time.

Mr. MILLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call the attention of the House to these resolutions for this reason: A resolution somewhat similar to this one went through the House a year or two ago, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN], and, as a result of it, it was held by the Federal courts that the beef trust, so called, could not be prosecuted. No one knows just how far an inquiry of this sort might go, and while I have no objection to a proper resolution upon subjects of this kind, it is a very poor legislative method to pass a resolution involving so much without the consideration of the proper committee of the House.

The Judiciary Committee may have given consideration to this subject, but we have no reports from that committee before the House. If the Secretary of Commerce and Labor should desire in his inquiry, or any of his subordinates without desire, should call upon these people to testify under subpoena, all prosecution of them would be ended. The very purpose of resolutions of this kind should be not to excuse the persons who are guilty, but to punish the persons who are guilty. We already have under the railroad-rate law that was passed at the last session of Congress—under a little amendment which was put in from the best of motives—the probability that the Standard Oil Company and its agents will escape conviction, because of the little harmless amendment inserted in that bill from the best of motives. I think that these matters ought to receive consideration by the committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the fears of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to any immunity resulting from this investigation or others like it are not well founded. Of course the courts of the United States have been at variance on the interpretation of similar investigations, but at the last session of Congress we passed a law interpreting all of our statutes relating to such investigations, making it impossible in the future to grant immunity to parties examined in these investigations, and making it apply only to cases where parties are called and compelled to testify against their interest in courts. So far as an investigation of the meat trust is concerned, there was no necessity for getting into the position of that investigation of granting immunity to anyone, because it was not necessary to call officers of the suspected corporations upon subjects of that character. Of course, lawyers, I think, agree all over the country that the interpretation placed on the law by Judge Humphrey, as the result of that investigation, was, perhaps, a stretch of the law and not warranted. At all events, subsequent legislation has settled that question so that we can with propriety direct as a House, as well as the Senate can direct as a separate body, investigations in this class of cases. I think we can with propriety direct investigations of this character without the fear suggested by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. MILLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If I remember, the gentleman was of the same impression about his own resolution. He and I discussed it several times before I consented that the House should take it up by unanimous consent. He was equally confident that his resolution could under no circumstances permit the people engaged in the claimed conspiracy of the beef trust to get out, while I had suspicion that it might have that result.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that all subsequent inves-

tigations of the Standard Oil, the coal trust, and other combinations have been made under resolutions following precisely the language of the one referred to, and the Department has steered clear of the complications which I think they unwittingly allowed themselves to be drawn into in the beef-trust investigation, which was the first of the kind.

Mr. MANN. It remains to be determined whether they have or not. They have not tried those cases in court yet.

Mr. MARTIN. Very well; but I think we have covered the whole subject now by legislation, so that I think there will be no danger in the future.

Mr. MANN. But I do not think we have.

Mr. MARTIN. At all events, there is nothing in that suggestion that would, I think, make it reasonable that this House should hesitate in its effort to arrive at the facts regarding any of these great combinations which are oppressing the country. Certainly the administrative officers of the Government have had their eyes sufficiently opened now to proceed with due caution in their investigations, and I have no doubt they will do so.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, as I stated before, in the railroad rate bill, there was a provision put in the law stating that although there was a repeal of conflicting statutes, that repeal should not affect prosecutions then pending in court, and it was assumed in the House that that would cover all cases of violation of the law previous to that date. Now, the Standard Oil people have been indicted for violations of section 1 of the Elkins law, which it is assumed has been repealed by the interstate-commerce law, and this little harmless provision of law providing that the repeal should not affect prosecutions pending in court is now said itself to that extent to repeal the general provision of the statute providing that a repeal shall not affect any prosecution, and to exempt the Standard Oil people from prosecution for offenses where they were not pending in court at the time of the passage of the railroad rate act, leaving them out from prosecution for all offenses previous to the time of the passage of the railroad rate act. It is just such harmless things that creep into legislation without proper consideration by a committee which defeat the ends of justice and prevent the prosecution of these men engaged in these combinations; and it seems to me a violent presumption to think that a resolution brought in here without consideration by a committee is equally guarded with one considered by the great Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] upon the subject of the repeal clause in the railroad rate bill hardly germane to the present discussion. Here is a resolution that now comes in proper form before this House for consideration. It is upon a matter of vital importance. The investigation ought to be had. Anyone familiar with the subject knows that the great advances in lumber over the country during the past five years have been so enormous as to properly attract the attention of the legislative branch of this Government and to demand an investigation. I think the resolution is in the form that we have adopted time and again in substance, and I think we can safely proceed to its passage at this time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, whether carefully digested by its author or not—and I take it that it has been—does not cover what might be called the "log trust." It provides for the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture. It seems to me that it may be made a broader and a better resolution if it would apply also to timber and logs and lumber, etc. I suggest something of that sort.

Mr. BANNON. Is not a log in process of manufacture as soon as it is cut from the tree?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am coming to that. Suppose these great concerns have bought in bulk, as they have done, great counties of trees fit for lumber, and they hold that timber there and put it on the market when they choose, and put up the price when they choose, when it is in the tree, and when it is in the log, and before it is manufactured into lumber—before it is lumber at all. I think if this matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee or to the Committee on Commerce, with directions to report a bill back here in three or four days, we can get a better resolution than this, though I shall vote for this.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I think perhaps I owe the House an explanation. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that this resolution was introduced into the House on the 10th of this month. Immediately upon its being received by the Committee on the Judiciary I sent a copy of the resolution to the Department of Commerce and Labor, with a letter. I have not yet had a reply to that communication, but just a few moments ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] submitted to me a letter addressed to myself from the Department of Commerce and Labor with reference to this subject. Now, the gentleman will see from my statement that it has been absolutely impossible for the Committee on the Judiciary to consider this resolution. We did not feel like taking it up until we had heard from the Department of Commerce and Labor. I will now ask the Clerk to read in my time the letter from the Department of Commerce and Labor which was handed to me by the gentleman from Kansas and which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF CORPORATIONS,
Washington, December 13, 1906.

Hon. JOHN J. JENKINS,
Chairman Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: By telephone conversation with Congressman MILLER yesterday I understand that both he and you desire expression of opinion from this Bureau upon House resolution No. 652, December 10, 1906, requesting investigation of the lumber industry by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

In reply thereto allow me to make a suggestion that lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on page 2, beginning with the words "to carry out" and ending with the words "United States," be stricken out entirely, for the reason that the organic act of this Department now gives the Commissioner of Corporations power to issue such subpoenas, administer oaths, etc., as set forth in the said five lines. There is, therefore, no need to give this power in the said resolution. Furthermore, the said powers in the organic act and the results of the exercise thereof have been carefully defined by "the act defining immunity of witnesses," etc., approved June 30, 1906, with the purpose of clearly determining all questions of immunity which might arise under the powers given the Commissioner.

Should the said lines referred to remain in the said resolution it is obvious that further questions might arise on this question of immunity.

Very respectfully,

HERBERT KNOX SMITH,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MILLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN COAL LANDS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present for consideration a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 643.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives a full and complete description of all public lands which have been withdrawn or reserved from entry, filing, or selection since the 1st day of July, 1906, together with a report as to the reasons for the said withdrawals and reservations, and as to the character of the same, and the present status of the lands relative to entry, filing, and selection under the land laws; also a tabulated statement of the areas withdrawn for various purposes in each public-land State and the total areas withdrawn in each State and in all of the public-land States.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

After the word "State," where it first appears in line 11, insert the words "and Territory;" in line 11 strike out the words "in each State and;" and at the end of the bill add the words "and Territories," and as amended that it do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that the amendments be agreed to.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574, being the bill providing for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 21574.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment or amendments be considered and be in order to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government (H. R. 21574) in the Committee of the Whole, increasing the compensation of the Speaker,

Members, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President and Senators, and members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that an amendment or amendments may be considered and be in order to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government (H. R. 21574) in the Committee of the Whole, increasing the compensation of the Speaker, Members, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President, Senators, and members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILBERT. Would it be in order to add to that resolution "and clerks in the Departments?" If that is in order, I move that as an amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. I could not now accept such an amendment. It is an entirely different field of service and has very broad bearings, differing widely from those concerned in this request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LITTAUER. I trust the gentleman from Alabama will withhold his objection to this request for unanimous consent in order that it may be considered in Committee of the Whole, so that we may get an expression of the Committee of the Whole on the subject. The request for unanimous consent will preclude a point of order being made in the committee against the consideration of a subject which has received general approval outside of Congress as well as in it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my very proposition. If this was a proposition that it should be considered in the House, it would be another matter. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to consider the proposition in the House and the House wishes to consider it, while I am against the proposition, I would not object to that.

Mr. LITTAUER. This is an appropriation and would necessarily have to go to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not look upon it as a proposition to appropriate money; I look upon it as a change of existing law, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LITTAUER. Which, in effect, requires an appropriation of money.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman agree to an amendment giving consideration in the House, and if the amendment should be adopted to the bill, that that amendment would be considered separately in the House?

Mr. LITTAUER. I not only agree to that, but—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from New York that it is quite competent for the House by unanimous consent, if it desires so to do, after this bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole House, to agree at this time that the matter about which the gentleman asks unanimous consent shall be considered in the House as an amendment to the bill, if it be reported from the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from New York that so far as I am concerned, if he desires to make his request that this matter may be considered, while I am opposed to the matter and intend to vote against it, I am perfectly willing that the House should consider it in the House; and if he will make his request that this matter shall be considered in the House after the House comes out of the Committee of the Whole on this bill, and will state that he will allow a reasonable time for debate on the question, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his objection.

Mr. LITTAUER. I modify my request to include the condition stated by the gentleman from Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was then taken on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to the following in the office of the President of the United States: Secretary, \$5,000; two assistant secretaries, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,500; executive clerk and disbursing officer, \$2,000; seven clerks, at \$2,000 each; one clerk of class 4, who shall be a telegrapher; four clerks of class 3; two clerks of class 2; steward, \$1,800; chief doorkeeper, \$1,800; eight doorkeepers, at \$1,200 each; four messengers, at \$1,200 each; five messengers, at \$900 each; watchman, \$900; one fireman; laborer, \$720; laborer, \$600; in all, \$67,740. *Provided*, That employees of the Executive Departments and other establishments of the executive branch of the Government may

be detailed from time to time to the office of the President of the United States for such temporary assistance as may be necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph, and wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there is any record as to the number of employees who are temporarily transferred from the different Departments to the office of the President?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will refer to the bill, from line 14 to and including line 18, page 35, that is in existing law.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is in existing law, but that does not authorize it here. I have no objection to the item, but I would like—

Mr. BINGHAM. The view the committee took was that the existing law seemed to be acceptable, and no proposition to change having been submitted, your committee as a rule continues current law.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand that to be the rule.

Mr. LITTAUER. There was no information brought to our committee, at least, as to how much advantage was taken of the privilege.

Mr. MANN. Are any of these people permanently employed up there, do you know?

Mr. LITTAUER. None; of that I am quite confident.

Mr. BINGHAM. There was no statement submitted whatever.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural carrier examining board: For one chief of division, \$2,000; one clerk of class 3; two clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks, at \$1,000 each; ten clerks, at \$900 each, and one assistant messenger; in all, \$22,720: *Provided*, That no detail of clerks or other employees from the Executive Departments or other Government establishments in Washington, D. C., to the Civil Service Commission, for the performance of duty in the District of Columbia, shall be made for or during the fiscal year 1908. The Civil Service Commission shall, however, have power to transfer or detail any of its employees herein provided for to or from its office force, field force, or rural carrier examining board.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on lines 14 to 17, page 37.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman that is current law.

Mr. MANN. If it is law it does not need to go in here, and if it is not law it is not entitled to go in here.

Mr. LITTAUER. It is current law, and I will give you an explanation of it. The Civil Service Commission has, year after year, asked us to amalgamate three forces together—the office force, the field force, and the rural carrier examining board. We have, however, declared we will not accept these lumpings of clerical assistance, but we want to know what each one has to do. Consequently we divided the force into three branches, and yet there are times when the clerks from one branch—for instance, the rural carrier examining board—must help out the field force or the office force, and in order to give them the privilege of utilizing services not required in one branch in another branch we have added that provision, which obtains in every Department.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I do not think it is a provision that obtains in every Department, and I see no special reason why the Civil Service Commission should be the first to violate the law.

Mr. LITTAUER. I think you are wrong. I think every Department has a right to transfer clerks from one bureau of the Department to another bureau, and it has the express statutory privilege. Here is a small bureau, or department you can call it, with three branches. We specify the force for each one of the three and then say if you have at any time an emergency in any one of those three branches take your additional assistants required from one of the other branches.

Mr. MANN. If you say "in case of an emergency" they can do this, I have no objection; but the fact is, you divide the force into three branches and then provided that they could use the men in any branch for the work in another branch and not pay any attention whatever to the division.

Mr. LITTAUER. But they do pay attention to the division, and come here every year asking us to wipe out the three divisions. They did it this year.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but I understand also that in effect they do wipe out these divisions which you insist upon preserving and thus permit them to escape from. They do make an escape. If you say in case of an emergency they can make the transfer, very well.

Mr. LITTAUER. There would be no harm at all in saying that. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment, I surely will not object to it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman offer it?

Mr. BINGHAM. They will determine what is the emergency.

Mr. MANN. They pay no attention to it practically at all, I am told—

Mr. LITTAUER. Would the gentleman suppose the use of the word "emergency" would make any difference?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; it would make a difference.

Mr. LITTAUER. I have no objection, if it will result in better administration. That is the purpose of your committee in submitting this.

Mr. MANN. How would it do to insert "have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail?"

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no objection.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and offer an amendment, to insert, after the word "power," in line 14, the words "in case of emergency."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, line 14, after the word "power," insert "in case of emergency."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall each year prepare and submit in his annual report to Congress estimates of the public revenue and the public expenditures for the fiscal year current, and also for the fiscal year next ensuing at the time said report is submitted, together with a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the preceding completed fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon that paragraph.

Mr. BINGHAM. What does the gentleman wish?

Mr. MANN. I would like to know why it should go in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Is this new?

Mr. BINGHAM. The chairman of the committee has had some correspondence in connection with this suggested amendment to the current law, and he will explain the character of the information that he desires.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the information of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and for the information of the committee, the reason for this provision. Until last year it was the custom of the Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report, to include not only statements of expenditures, but also an estimate of the amount of revenue the Secretary of the Treasury has reason to believe the Government will receive during the next fiscal year. It is upon this estimate that the amount of the budgets or appropriation bills are largely based. For the fiscal year 1906 the Secretary of the Treasury omitted this estimate from his annual report. In submitting to the House, at the close of the last session, a statement of the aggregate appropriations the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was unable to obtain from the Treasury Department an estimate of the revenues for the fiscal year 1907 for which Congress made the appropriations.

I personally addressed a letter to the Secretary for the purpose of obtaining an estimate. I did not care to bring it into the House or have the statement go to the country that we had appropriated about \$880,000,000 for the fiscal year 1907 without being able to show that the Government was reasonably certain of having sufficient revenue during the year to meet these appropriations. Thereupon I wrote a letter to the Secretary and asked him to give me an estimate of the probable revenue for that year, calling his attention to the fact that his annual report did not, as usual, contain this estimate. The Secretary declined, saying that it would be only a guess, and that he did not care to make a guess on the subject. There is no department of the Government so well equipped to estimate with reasonable certainty the revenues for the coming fiscal year as the Treasury Department. It has therefore been the custom for Congress to rely upon these estimates in preparing the appropriations. In view of the necessity for this information and the fact that it was refused, your committee felt justified in proposing this provision for that purpose. Without this estimate Congress has nothing to guide it in determining whether the aggregate of appropriations will exceed the revenues or not.

Mr. MANN. Has this matter been brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TAWNEY. This provision?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not. It was brought to his attention by me as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations before the close of last session, when in a letter I requested the Secretary to give the committee an estimate of the revenue and he declined.

Mr. MANN. And in response he stated it was impossible.

Thereupon you propose by law to compel him to do that which he says is impossible.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not been impossible in the past. It has been the uniform custom for a great many years for the Secretary of the Treasury to submit an estimate of revenue for the coming fiscal year, and the present Secretary himself submitted an estimate in the annual report preceding his annual report for the fiscal year 1906.

Mr. MANN. He says now that those estimates are valueless.

Mr. TAWNEY. They have served as a guide, and it is very important to the general public and to Congress to know whether or not—

Mr. MANN. I would not dispute the word of the eminent chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, although I have never noticed that Congress paid much attention to that estimate in making appropriations.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Illinois can not cite us to an instance when Congress deliberately appropriated beyond the estimated revenue. The gentleman must also know that in the preparation of appropriation bills Congress must necessarily have information as to the probable revenues of the Government for the fiscal year for which it makes appropriations.

Now, to what Department of the Government can Congress look for that information if not to the Treasury Department? That Department controls all the machinery for the collection of revenue. It is in touch with the revenues of the Government and is charged with the execution of the revenue laws. Certainly if it is not possible for the Treasury Department to give it, it would be impossible for any other Department to furnish it. The estimate submitted at the last session is an estimate that the chairman himself made, showing a surplus of \$40,000,000, and is the only official estimate of revenue for this fiscal year Congress or the country has had. There is no foreign government that does not submit to the legislative department its estimate of the revenues, and upon these estimates the appropriations are based.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Why does the Secretary of the Treasury decline to give this information?

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, the only answer we received was that it would be a mere guess. That is the language, as I now recall.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman disagree with the Secretary of the Treasury upon the matter?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will this impose additional labor on the Government?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not at all.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will it cost the Government anything at all?

Mr. TAWNEY. Nothing at all.

Mr. MANN. That is what I want to know about.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Secretary is guessing upon the revenues of the current year from day to day. We are now told by the Treasury Department that the surplus during this fiscal year will amount to in the neighborhood of \$55,000,000 or \$60,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. What the gentleman says is so patent, apparently, that it seems to me that before enacting legislation along these lines to compel a public servant to do this thing which he has been doing in the past, but which he now refuses to do, that we ought to know from him why he has refused.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did say why he has refused.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman tell us why?

Mr. TAWNEY. I said he refused because he considered his estimate a mere guess.

Mr. MANN. He refused to give the gentleman the information in response to a private letter?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; it was not a private letter, it was an official letter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated he addressed it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I addressed him as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. He was not required by law or custom to do so.

Mr. TAWNEY. He was required by custom to submit estimates of the revenues, and I maintain that a fair construction of his duties as defined by law requires him to do so. As to why it was not done this year I do not know. I do not say this or propose this provision in any spirit of criticism or as any reflection upon the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether you are making a reflection or not.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have no doubt that the Secretary will comply, and all Secretaries will comply with this provision hereafter to the best of their ability, and that is all we expect. I do not think Congress ought to be put in the position of being left to depend upon the whim of any future Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he shall give information as to what the revenues of the Government will be for the next fiscal year. Certain it is he can give a reasonably accurate estimate with the information the Treasury Department has at its hand and its facilities for obtaining information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman assumes here is a matter of interesting information that must be obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury, information that the Secretary has heretofore afforded, and that the Secretary has now refused to give that information, and thereupon the gentleman stops.

Mr. TAWNEY. No, I do not.

Mr. MANN. We ought to know from the Secretary of the Treasury why he has declined to give this information.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is nothing further to do in respect to obtaining that information but to put a provision in here requiring the Treasury Department, as a matter of law, to submit it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman ought to ask the Secretary of the Treasury why he declined to give the information.

Mr. BRICK. He did.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can submit the letter to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I take the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. BRICK. The gentleman stated that the Secretary did not give the information because it would be a mere guess.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Who disputes his explanation?

Mr. MANN. If that be the truth, that this is a mere guess, then it ought not to be enacted into law.

Mr. BONYNGE. The chairman does not agree with him that this is a mere guess.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not necessarily a mere guess. It has not been so in the past, and I do not think it will be so in the future.

Mr. MANN. Does the chairman think this is necessary?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk will not read until we dispose of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman had made any point of order.

Mr. MANN. I reserved it, but I now withdraw the point.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at Chicago: For assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$3,000; vault clerk, \$1,800; paying teller, \$1,800; assorting teller, \$1,800; silver and redemption teller, and change teller, at \$1,800 each; receiving teller, \$1,700; clerk, \$1,600; bookkeeper, \$1,800; two bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; assistant paying teller, \$1,500; four coin, coupon, and currency clerks, at \$1,500 each; twenty-six clerks, at \$1,200 each; one detective and hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; stenographer, \$900; janitor, \$600; and three watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$69,400.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. I have called the attention of the committee upon several occasions to the discrepancy in the salaries paid in the offices of the assistant treasurers. Chicago, which does the largest business in volume outside of New York City—and possibly in the number of transactions almost as large a business as New York City, because Chicago has an immense field from the Post-Office Department, which makes daily remittances, much larger than New York City—Chicago is discriminated against even in this bill.

In Boston there are four employees in the subtreasury receiving salaries of \$2,000 and upward. In Philadelphia there are three, in St. Louis there are two, in New Orleans there are three, in San Francisco there are six; while in Chicago there is but one.

In addition to that fact, the responsibility which some of these tellers assume is very great. During the last year or two in Chicago, when a new assistant treasurer was appointed, one or two of the tellers, who had taken in money theretofore passed and accepted by the Government in the form in which it was, under the rules and regulations of the Treasury Department, had coin thrown back upon them to the extent of several hundred dollars each. These gentlemen receive the munificent salary of seventeen or eighteen hundred dollars a year. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman if he is not willing to make some increases in this office? If there ever was a time when we could make an increase, it is now. If there ever was a time when it was needed, it is now. With the exception of the one increase that is proposed in the bill and two increases which were made two or three years ago, there has been no increase in the salaries of these employees for many, many years.

Mr. BINGHAM. I submit to the gentleman that there has been no intentional discrimination against Chicago.

Mr. MANN. No; I understand that.

Mr. BINGHAM. So far as the Chicago office is concerned, I have no doubt the gentleman approves of the increase of \$500 which we have given. There is no doubt that Chicago is the second subtreasury—next to New York; but during the past ten years there has been a large increase in the force of the Chicago office; perhaps larger than in any other subtreasury in the country.

Mr. MANN. An increase in the force and in the business, but not in the compensation of individuals.

Mr. BINGHAM. An occasional increase in compensation and a large increase in the force, and there has never been, if I remember, what might be called a serious complaint. All the subtreasurers asked increases, and there was no special insistence with regard to this subtreasury; and your committee felt that as the force was ample for the work and that they have been receiving a reasonable compensation, with the one exception which we increased and which we called an exception, it was fair to continue the office under its present ratings and allowances.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, he says there has been no insistence before the committee. The subtreasurer in Chicago is forbidden, and the officials of the subtreasury there are forbidden, to appear before your committee, and they are forbidden to appeal to Members of Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. MANN. They are forbidden to do anything, and there is nothing that can be done except a recommendation through the Department. I take it that that recommendation was made to your committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. In a general way, yes, just as the Department makes many recommendations, but your committee reached the conclusion, after hearing Mr. Keep, who went into the matter with considerable detail, as the gentleman knows if he has read the hearings—

Mr. MANN. I have never seen the hearings on that subject, so I do not know. But I know this, if I may say so to the gentleman—I know there has been a most insistent demand on the part of the retiring assistant treasurer and upon the part of the one who has recently been appointed that these salaries be increased, this recommendation having been made after investigation, and I know they have not been able to obtain and retain good employees in some of these places. There have been a number of changes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have made all the explanation that it is possible to make. I think it is a fair explanation. The work is being done well. There may be some reasonable criticism as to the compensations, but your committee reached the conclusion that the conditions at the independent treasuries might remain as they were, with the little change made in Chicago, without any injury to the public service.

Mr. MANN. I assure the gentleman that it is injuring the public service in Chicago. They have a row on now, growing out of having these very clerks held responsible for the acceptance of this coin. There has been a row between the Treasury Department and the retiring subtreasurer in reference to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is in litigation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no, it is not, and we will never submit to its going that far; but the Government is requiring a very unjust thing on the part of the subtreasurer, for the reason that these employees were not able out of their salaries to replace the coin which they had on hand, but which the Government would not accept as current funds.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman sees that that would open up a question of which we could not take cognizance, unless the gentleman sees proper to offer independent legislation as to the responsibility whenever in the operation of any financial institution such a question as this should arise.

Mr. MANN. If we hold a clerk responsible for such things, after the coin has once been accepted by the Government, I want to see the clerk paid salary enough so that we may properly hold him responsible. But why should the teller in Chicago receive a salary of \$1,800, and tellers in Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco, doing not one-tenth of the business, receive salaries of \$2,000, \$2,200, or \$2,500?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, yes; they do more than the gentleman says, because Philadelphia comes next to Chicago in the amount of business.

Mr. MANN. I do not mean to say that all of these places do not do one-tenth of the business.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee have endeavored to do substantial justice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no arguing with the gentleman, but I move to amend by striking out, in line 11, page 65, the words "one thousand eight hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 11, strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand."

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order that it changes existing law. The authorization of the law is \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman the statute before him—the present law?

Mr. BINGHAM. The present appropriation law governs the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois state whether the statute fixes the salary at \$2,000? Will the gentleman from Illinois cite the statute, if such a statute exists?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there is no statute fixing the salary of any of these officers, except the current appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair would ask the gentleman what was the amount carried in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct. As I understand, the gentleman from Pennsylvania states that it was the same amount that is in this bill—\$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair finally rules, may I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under the ruling of the Chair last year the whole item is probably subject to a point of order, because, as I understand, the ruling of the Chair last year was that where there was no authority of law for an office the item was subject to a point of order. If the item in the original instance in this case was subject to a point of order, changing the amount is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that this item was appropriated for in the identical language of the last appropriation bill. If that is so, then the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. The ruling last year by the gentleman in the chair at that time was, that although the current appropriation act appropriated for certain clerks at a certain salary, that did not warrant the same item being included in the bill then pending unless it was authorized by statute. That was the ruling last year, resulting in the throwing out of a great number of these officers, clerks, and salaries, to such an extent that the committee were compelled to appeal to the Committee on Rules, which brought in a special rule giving the right to the consideration of these items in the bill. If that ruling was right last year, this item in the original instance was subject to a point of order. I know there has been a lot of holding, and I think the Chair can find authority to hold any way the Chair desires on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of that suggestion, the Chair will adhere to his ruling. [Laughter.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERMAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6855. An act to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea."

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of War, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,000; stenographer to the Secretary, \$1,800; clerk to the Assistant Secretary, \$2,100; clerk to the chief clerk, \$2,100; disbursing clerk, \$2,500; appointment clerk, \$2,000; four chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; superintendent of buildings outside of State, War, and Navy Department building, in addition to compensation as chief of division, \$250; chief telegrapher, \$1,800; four clerks of class 4; four clerks of class 3; fourteen clerks of class 2; eighteen clerks of class 1; five clerks, at \$1,000 each; one clerk, \$900; one clerk, at \$720; one foreman, \$1,200; carpenter, \$1,000; chief messenger, \$1,000; two carpenters, at \$900 each; six messengers; seven assistant messengers; one telephone switchboard operator; one assistant telephone switchboard operator; two messenger boys, at \$360 each; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; one fireman; four watchmen; five watchmen, at \$660 each;

eight laborers; two laborers, at \$470 each; hostler, \$600; two hostlers and one watchman, at \$540 each; one telephone operator, \$480; two elevator conductors, one at \$600 and one at \$470; four charwomen; in all, \$138,620.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 81, line 3, strike out the words "six hundred and twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "five hundred and sixty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, \$8,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$4,500, and for additional compensation while the office is held by the present incumbent, \$1,500; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,500, and \$500 additional as superintendent of the Patent Office building and other buildings of the Department of the Interior; additional to one member of Board of Pension Appeals, acting as chief of the board, \$500; twelve members of a Board of Pension Appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each, including three members to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior from the sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals appropriated for and employed during the fiscal year 1907; three additional members of said Board of Pension Appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each; special land inspector, connected with the administration of the public-land service, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction, \$2,500; five special inspectors, Department of the Interior, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction, at \$2,500 each; clerk in charge of documents, \$2,100; custodian, who shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,100; seven clerks, chiefs of division, at \$2,250 each, one of whom shall be disbursing clerk; four clerks, at \$2,000 each; private secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, \$2,500; sixteen clerks of class 4; sixteen clerks of class 3; twenty-five clerks of class 2; thirty-six clerks of class 1, two of whom shall be stenographers or typewriters; returns office clerk, \$1,200; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, \$1,200; six clerks, at \$1,000 each; one clerk, \$900; twelve copyists; two copyists or typewriters, at \$900 each; switchboard telephone operator; nine messengers; seven assistant messengers; eighteen laborers; two skilled mechanics, one at \$900 and one at \$720; two carpenters, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; electrician, \$1,000; one laborer, \$600; six laborers, at \$480 each; one packer, \$660; two conductors of elevator, at \$720 each; four charwomen; captain of the watch, \$1,200; forty watchmen; additional to two watchmen acting as lieutenants of watchmen, at \$120 each; engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; seven firemen; one clerk, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him, his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$327,690.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out after the word "each," in line 9, page 106 of the bill, the following:

"Including three members to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior from the sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals, appropriated for and employed during the fiscal year 1907; three additional members of said Board of Pension Appeals to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals, to be selected and appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from persons not now employed in the Pension Office, and without compliance with the conditions prescribed by the act entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service,' approved January 16, 1883, for the fiscal year 1908, at \$2,000 each; and vacancies occurring in this force of sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals during the fiscal year 1908 shall not be filled."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the proposed amendment is a change of existing law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have submitted is identical, with the exception of one word, with the current appropriation bill. It is a continuance of the board as created three or four years ago and as carried year after year in the appropriation bill. The only change is of a single word, which is this: In the present appropriation bill it provides that vacancies occurring during the fiscal year of 1907 shall not be refilled. This amendment provides that vacancies occurring in the year 1908 shall not be filled. The provisions are identical, except the word "eight" instead of the word "seven."

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; and that is the radical change in the law.

Mr. DALZELL. No; it is the purpose to continue the law.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, you continue the board which the law says shall expire.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; the law says vacancies occurring during the year shall not be filled, and I say that vacancies occurring during the coming year shall not be filled. We do not ask any other change.

Mr. LITTAUER. The law also adds that at the end of 1907 said employment shall cease.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, you continue the current law another year. The current law distinctly sets forth that

it shall conclude at the end of 1907. Gentlemen understand how reluctantly I do this, because I am a soldier myself.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the situation is that the law originally provided for the appointment of what is called the "permanent board of appeals," consisting of twelve members. Later on there was legislation increasing that membership by authorizing twenty temporaries, and that provision was carried on from year to year, and last year the current appropriation bill provided for sixteen members only of the temporary members of the board, and provided that at the end of the fiscal year their employment should cease. Now, the committee has reported an appropriation for three of that sixteen, and that is a part of the bill, and no point of order was made against it, so that it is in the bill, but it is new legislation. The committee now reports an appropriation for three members of a temporary board of appeals for which there is no law. The effect of the proposed amendment is to increase the number from three to sixteen. I assume that where the committee brings in legislation that is subject to a point of order, if no point be made the provision is amendable.

Mr. BINGHAM. That original provision was subject to a point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; and it is amendable.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If an amendment is in order to increase the number to four, it certainly is in order to increase it to sixteen. That is the situation of this question as it is now presented.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it be in order to increase the number from three to sixteen, is it in order to increase it to sixteen with the various additions added to the amendment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Those provisions are pure limitations. We may increase the force with limitations, providing how the additional members shall be paid and how they shall be appointed. I think those provisions are proper limitations. Now, I insist, since the committee has made provision for three for which there is no authority in law, it opens the door for any sort of a germane amendment. It is a new subject, and we may increase the number from three to sixteen and may fix terms and limitations that are germane. It is a new subject of legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order further than to emphasize what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has said, that it has always been held that where a provision is brought in which is subject to a point of order and no point of order is raised against it, an amendment perfecting that provision is in order.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy the time of the committee, except to emphasize what the gentleman from Indiana has said.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the other side that the Chair desires to hear from.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] did not, as I understand it, attempt to amend that part of the paragraph where provision is made for the additional three members to the permanent force, but did seek to reinstate the language of the present current law, wherein a provision was added that "at the end of which year such employment shall cease." I can not appreciate the point made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that in the method in which this amendment is presented it does not contravene the rule against new legislation. It appears to me to be an entirely different set of pension-appeal examiners, one temporary and the other permanent.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to this fact, that if the committee can add three it can add six or nine or sixteen. If three are in order, the whole sixteen are in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. All of which would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Would have been, yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; would have been.

The CHAIRMAN. If a point of order had been made against the text of the bill the Chair would have sustained that point of order, but no such point of order was made. That being so, it is clear to the Chair that any amendment that is germane to that matter is competent for the committee to consider. The point of order is therefore overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, before that question is taken it seems to me that the Committee of the Whole should at least be placed in possession of the facts in connection with this tem-

porary board of pension appeals. The committee will remember that a board of nine members was originally established and was then increased to twelve and then, I believe some three years ago, an additional force of twenty temporary appointees was placed there at a time when the number of appeals accumulated in the office of the Secretary of the Interior numbered about 20,000. The work had gone on, I believe, for two or three years when last year we were confronted with the fact that the number of these appeals had been reduced from 20,000 to about 3,000. We then amended the law, or the provision for the law, so that vacancies that then existed could not be filled, and that no further vacancies could be filled during the current year. Moreover, we added the provision that the force itself should be entirely discontinued at the end of the current year—that is, the temporary force. The original nine, with the added three, are there under a permanent order. This is one of the temporary forces added to clean up work in a great Department, to do justice to the old soldier in order that his claims of every kind and character might have final and proper consideration before a great board of pension appeals. Unfortunately the only way to get such a board is to give temporary employment. The employment was given, of course, without civil service examination, and the result is that, as far as my experience has gone, whenever you get such a force in you can never get it out, and the only way to do is to amalgamate it with the regular force.

Now, the facts in the case are that we have had about twenty-eight of these pension-appeal examiners, and they passed upon one case of appeal a day, just one appeal during the seven or seven and a half hours' work which we have here, and bear in mind that these appeals come to them after having passed through, I believe, three or four prior examinations in the Pension Office. The appeals come all briefed, and they include some appeals in reference to pension attorneys' fees, perhaps not a great number, but quite a good number of them.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do.

Mr. KEIFER. I understood the gentleman to say these members of the pension-appeal board dispose of but one appeal a day.

Mr. LITTAUER. Just one.

Mr. KEIFER. Just one. The record shows that twenty-eight members have disposed of an average of 824 per month.

Mr. LITTAUER. No; 867.

Mr. KEIFER. Well, I am speaking of an average for a particular five months. How do you make that out?

Mr. LITTAUER. During the last seven months, commencing February, 1906, during that period 6,059 cases have been disposed of, averaging 867 each month. Divide the twenty-eight into the 867 and you get—well, one is not exactly right, because there are only twenty-six working days, but in twenty-six working days thirty-one of these appeal cases are disposed of by each examiner.

Mr. OVERSTREET. How many appeals are now pending? How nearly up is this board?

Mr. SHERMAN. Seventeen hundred and twelve.

Mr. LITTAUER. I will get to that. A year ago we were advised that there were 3,000 cases yet undetermined and that at that time the force was catching up at quite a rapid rate, so we attempted last year to eliminate this board, but in order to give ample force to continue the work all places which were filled at that time were continued to the number—

Mr. TAWNEY. Will my colleague permit an interruption?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact the limitation upon the life of the board carried in the current law was placed there upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LITTAUER. On the express recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, reenforced by the recommendation of the at that time Commissioner of Pensions. All of them advised us that board could well cease and end at the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. KEIFER. I would like to interrupt the gentleman again.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand that both the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman on the floor say that this reduction was made at the instance of the Secretary of the Interior last year. I beg leave to say that the Secretary of the Interior qualified all that original recommendation both before the Committee on Appropriations and in the

House and Senate, and stated if there was an increase in the appeals it would not be sufficient.

Mr. LITTAUER. When was that qualification made?

Mr. KEIFER. Made in the Record. The chairman read it the other day.

Mr. LITTAUER. Now, the Record shows that during the years this pension board has been at work, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, 13,719 cases were disposed of. The next year, with the same force, 10,496 cases received final attention. The next year it jumped up again to 13,715, and the last year, ending June 30 last, when this board had the full number of thirty-two members, there were 10,173 cases disposed of, a reduction of 3,542 from the previous year.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What number of cases are now pending for consideration by the board of appeals?

Mr. LITTAUER. We are advised here, October 1, 1906, 1,712 cases. That is about two months' work, and your committee, considering all the circumstances of this—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does that make provision for cases subsequently appealed to the board?

Mr. LITTAUER. I have given you simply a statement of the number of cases before the board on that day—that is, October the 1st. The cases appealed during the month of September were of course in that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman from New York any information as to the number of cases that were pending before the commission a year ago?

Mr. LITTAUER. A year ago there were 3,000—just about 3,050, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. At that ratio it would take a full year, at least, to catch up with the work?

Mr. LITTAUER. It depends altogether, of course, on the number of new cases that come along. It used to take two or three years to have one of these appeals attended to. It now takes less than two or three months. I maintain that if the appeals were doubled up from what they are to-day the old soldier's interest would be promptly attended to. I believe the last advice I had was that 7 per cent of these appeals are reversed.

Mr. KEIFER. Nine.

Mr. LITTAUER. My last information, from a very reliable source, was that it was 7, although I must admit that the Secretary of the Interior in here says that he thinks it was 15; latterly we got information that it was 9. But whether it be 9 or 7, those are the only individuals who can in any way suffer any harm from this appeal of two or three months.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But if the gentleman will permit me, when a man makes an appeal it is important to him that he have a decision on it one way or the other.

Mr. LITTAUER. That is unquestionably so, and the decision he no doubt would like to have that very minute, but most of the appeals take more than two months to be disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this question resolves itself into whether or not this temporary force shall be continued a sufficient length of time to bring the work up current. The board is now over 1,400 cases behind. On the statement of Assistant Secretary Wilson the appeals run from 800 to 900 a month. This board with the present force will take care of just about that number. It has been reduced by resignations and otherwise by four members. When it had the full number it took care of about 1,000 cases a month. Now it takes care of between 800 and 900. The appeals have constantly increased since appellants find they can get a comparatively early decision from the court. There is no reason to think that that condition of things will not obtain in the future; that the number of appeals will at least remain where it is now. That being the case, it is necessary to have the full number if you would give a prompt decision to these men, to many of whom delay means death before the decision is made. I say to you, gentlemen, that we can well afford to give the veterans the benefit of any doubt for twelve months more. That is the limitation put upon the membership of the court by the pending amendment.

Put these trained men at work twelve months more and give them an opportunity, at least, to bring the appeals down current with the applications made. What harm can come of it? Suppose you do not do it? Then, on the statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, your appeals will continue to increase month by month until sooner or later you will have to go over

this same course of procedure and employ not a trained body of experts, but a new body of men, to take up the work where these men leave off. The time has come when we can not afford to dally with interests vital to many of these men for the pitance involved in this amendment. Let us pass it, and let these men who now take their appeal be responded to promptly, as they responded promptly when the nation appealed to them to save its life. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have statistics, obtained from some source, and I want to know if they were submitted to the committee. They show that last year, 1905, for five months from July 1, there were 2,658 appeals, at the rate of 531 per month. The same month this year, beginning July 1 last, there were 4,120 appeals taken, at the rate of 824 a month.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is substantially in the hearings.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That was in the hearings?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Substantially.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And on the basis of the statistics last year this recommendation contained in the current bill was incorporated, providing that the tenure ceased on the 1st of July; and the increased number of appeals, I understand, is one of the chief reasons why the gentleman insists upon keeping the whole board in operation.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the gentleman will allow me to read. Mr. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, says: But the appeals are coming in between 800 and 900 a month now.

The gentleman will find that on page 227.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does he recommend the retention of the entire board this year?

Mr. KEIFER. He says they could only dispose of a thousand cases when they had four more members than they have now. He says repeatedly, in substance, that they can not dispose of the appeals if you reduce the board, because of the accumulation of appeals, and he urges the retention of the full board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, my honored colleague makes the suggestion that the only people who would be harmed by the provisions of the bill in doing away with this special board are the appellants. I know so well, Mr. Chairman, that my honored colleague is desirous of serving in every legitimate way the old soldiers that I do not believe he wants that statement to remain unqualified, especially when we remember that there is no body of men in this country that Congress is more desirous of serving than this same body; there is nobody that they are more desirous to save from any harm whatever.

Now, my colleague suggests that last year the Secretary said that this board could be done away with. He substantially said that upon the recommendation of the Secretary a year ago they inserted the provision that the board should cease to exist at the end of this fiscal year. In other words, the position of the committee then was to take its stand upon the recommendation of the Secretary; whereas this year, when the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and the Commissioner all unite in recommending that this board be continued, they propose not to follow that recommendation. It is very easy, when the recommendations of the Secretary are in accordance with our ideas to appeal to the recommendation to sustain our position, but when it is adverse, why we override it.

My colleague says, and says erroneously, that there is but one appeal decided a day. It is not quite correct, but the average is less than two. But, Mr. Chairman, do we wish to have these appeals hurriedly passed upon, without doing justice to the appellant and to the Government. The report and the hearings before the committee, and the statement of the Secretary, show that varied and numerous legal questions, as well as questions of fact, arise in these cases—questions relating to the marriage laws of the various States, etc. Certainly it is not the desire of Congress, in the work of passing upon these appeals, to be so hurried as to do injustice either to the appellant or the Government of the United States.

Now, before this board was created there were 16,000 cases unheard, and it took more than two years for an appeal to be heard, and I am making that statement from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. Two years ago there were 3,000 cases pending at the end of the year, and the board was continued for another year. On the 1st of October last there were 1,700 cases pending, and taking an average from this report from the hearing before the committee there will come in, as has been stated, an increase from month to month,

but taking the average last given here there will be 9,606 new cases to be disposed of, and there were 1,712 pending on the 1st day of October; so that there will be 11,318 cases to dispose of during the next fiscal year, and the present board disposed of 10,173. So that if the average of new appeals is not increased, there will still be at the end of the next fiscal year cases pending that the board will not have been able to consider even if it is maintained at its present number.

Mr. Chairman, where the interests of the old soldier and the interests of the Government are so vital as they are in this case it does seem to me that in justice to the Government and in justice to them that we ought to continue this board, in accordance with the recommendation of all the people who know about it and make report and appear before the committee and make statements of fact. We ought to continue this board for at least one more year. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if I know myself, I have not the slightest disposition to do an injustice to the old soldier; but how any intelligent man can vote for this amendment, after the clear and comprehensive statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], I can not understand. From the remarks that have been made in support of this amendment one might conclude that there was a disposition here on the part of somebody not to serve the old soldier, but, on the contrary, to do an act of injustice to the old soldier. Is this true? As a matter of fact, and every man here knows it, on the statute books are found the most liberal, yes, the most generous, pension laws that have ever been enacted by any country during the history of the civilized world. We have a horde of clerks in the Pension Bureau—all of whom are favorable to the old soldier—to construe these pension laws when he files his application under them. After these generous laws have been construed by clerks who are, as I have said, biased in favor of the old soldier, if perchance their action is adverse to the claim of the old soldier he has the right to appeal to a Board of Review, and on that Board there is not one single individual hostile to the old soldier. If, again, this Board's decision is again adverse to the old soldier, he has the further right to appeal to the Board of Rereview, as it is termed; and if here the decision is adverse he can carry his case to the Commissioner of Pensions, and from the Commissioner of Pensions he can finally appeal to the Secretary of the Interior. At each of these points you afford him, if he can show an act of injustice has been done, the opportunity to have it righted. And, yet, Mr. Chairman, we are importuned to be cautious for fear that an injustice will be done the old soldier.

There is no necessity for this Board of Appeals now, and, as for that matter, there was no need for it at the time, a few years ago, when the original item was embodied in the appropriation bill. It never should have been in here, and if now stricken out the only ones hurt by it will be certain favorites who are now holding the places. You may be sure no injustice will be done any soldier by unnecessarily delaying action on his claim for pension or increase of pension.

Mr. Chairman, I charge—and there may be some men on this floor who will deny it, but I assert it as a fact, and no man on the Appropriations Committee will deny it—originally the places created by this item was rank patronage, nothing but patronage, intended to serve Members of Congress rather than to serve the old soldier. And now, when the recommendation has been made to discontinue this in the interests of economy, a motion is made here to embody it in the permanent law. And, as a matter of fact, gentlemen, I know full well that this amendment will be voted up. You will adopt it; and as a matter of fact it would have been adopted just as easily if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] had moved to put in thirty-two instead of sixteen persons on this board.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not wish to make a misstatement.

Mr. BURLESON. No; I never do if I know myself.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I say I am sure of it. Hence the gentleman will allow me to correct him when he says the purpose of this amendment is to enact this additional force into permanent law. It is simply for one year, to enable the work to be brought up.

Mr. BURLESON. And the gentleman, who has been upon the Committee on Appropriations for many years, knows—yes, out of the storehouse of his experience there can be had a certain knowledge—that when once an item finds place in an appropriation bill it is nearly impossible to get the item out.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself for one moment to the necessity for this Board. There are 1,700 cases now pending on appeal; and about 800 new appeals every month. The information that comes to us is that this Board disposes of about 800 cases a month. No wonder they do not bring the business

abreast of current work. Here we have the sixteen members of this Board, each disposing of about one case a day, or, to be perfectly accurate, one and five twenty-sixths, or one and two-thirteenths cases each day. Of course it is not to their interest to work themselves out of a fat job. Yet, Mr. Chairman, every lawyer of intelligence here knows that these cases come to this Board thoroughly briefed, and the most complicated of them ought to be easily disposed of in one hour's time. It would be curious, Mr. Chairman, if we could ascertain just where the various men who hold these places and who are to be appointed come from. I doubt not a flood of light would be turned upon this discussion, and really we could then understand matters just as they are.

I stand here to confirm every word that has been uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], and I stand here to assert that there is absolutely no necessity for the continuation of this Board one day longer, much less convert it into a permanent Board by adopting this amendment. They could all be abolished without any fear of doing the old soldiers an act of injustice.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat says that he stands here to confirm every word uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER]. That gentleman says that the records show that the board, continued as is proposed by the committee, would amply dispose of the pension-appeal cases. I beg to say that that statement can not be confirmed, and I want to say, in the hearing of the gentleman from New York, that he received from the Interior Department a letter, which he never presented to the committee and never referred to here, which shows that that statement is absolutely untrue. Does the gentleman dispute that?

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes. Do you dispute that? I have the letter here.

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me, the question as to the correctness of the statement that the Board as composed would amply dispose of the pension-appeal cases is simply an inference. The letter was a personal letter, reinforcing somewhat the testimony which the Assistant Secretary gave as printed in the hearings. It was not an official communication. In my rehearsal of the facts in connection with this matter before the full committee I read to the committee every single figure that was in that letter, and the gentleman from Ohio sat there, perhaps listening and perhaps not.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that the letter was never read there, or the gentleman would not have made the statement just made. That letter shows that for the months of July, August, September, October, and November, 1906, the appeals filed were 4,120, and the appeals disposed of were 3,984, less by about 200 than the appeals filed, without going to the old cases in arrears at all. Does that justify the statement that a board that would dispose of three-fifths as many as have been disposed of in the past five months could keep up promptly?

Mr. LITTAUER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Can he explain to me why this same Board in the year ending June 30, 1906, disposed of 10,173 cases, while in the previous year, with the same number of men on the Board, it disposed of 13,715?

Mr. KEIFER. The question contains an error. The same Board did not exist before this fiscal year by a great way. The Board before this time you refer to consisted of thirty-two instead of twenty-eight, added to by two men detailed from the Attorney-General's office and a man from the Land Office to help them, thus adding three more to the efficiency of the Board.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman wants to state the facts correctly?

Mr. KEIFER. The facts I gave in my speech a few days ago. You had an opportunity to show by the statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior that it would not be possible for you to cut the Board down as is proposed and ever get in sight of clearing up the pension appeals. We would run behind in one year about 4,000 at least. We had also on the 1st day of December arrears, according to this letter of December 6 to the gentleman from New York, of 1,776 appeals. Now, somebody says the appealed cases come briefed. Surely that is a very nice statement. If you are asking for a case to come briefed against the old soldier who appeals, and then ask the person who is reviewing to decide it on the brief that is made up to reject his claim, well and good. But it has to be rebriefed by some member of the Board and then taken to another portion of the twenty-eight, and finally be reviewed before the whole Board. It is not one man sitting as an appeal board, but you have to

rebrief it, and the larger the record the greater the labor. That is the way justice is often done to these old soldiers. Now, there is nothing anywhere in the record that justifies the statement that the Board continued as last year, with twelve permanent and sixteen additional members, will be able to keep up with the filed appealed cases when thirteen of the members are dropped, and we will certainly make no mistake if we leave it as it was the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: For the Commissioner of Pensions, \$5,000; First Deputy Commissioner, \$3,600; Second Deputy Commissioner, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$2,250; assistant chief clerk, \$2,000; medical referee, \$3,000; assistant medical referee, \$2,250; 2 qualified surgeons who shall be experts in their profession, at \$2,000 each; 35 medical examiners who shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, at \$1,800 each; 9 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; law clerk, \$2,250; chief of board of review, \$2,250; 55 principal examiners, at \$2,000 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions, \$2,000; 18 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,800 each; 3 stenographers, at \$1,600 each; 69 clerks of class 4; 85 clerks of class 3; 265 clerks of class 2; 335 clerks of class 1; 200 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 94 copyists; superintendent of building, \$1,400; 2 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 3 firemen; 27 messengers; 12 assistant messengers; 20 messenger boys, at \$400 each; 43 laborers; 10 female laborers, at \$400 each; 15 charwomen; 1 painter, skilled in his trade, \$900; 1 cabinetmaker, skilled in his trade, \$900; captain of the watch, \$840; 3 sergeants of the watch, at \$750 each; 20 watchmen; in all, \$1,678,750.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 114, line 23, strike out the words "two hundred and sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred;" in line 24 strike out the words "three hundred and thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred and seventy;" in line 25 strike out the words "two hundred" and insert the words "one hundred and sixty-five." On page 115, line 1, strike out the word "ninety-four" and insert the word "sixty-nine;" and in lines 12 and 13 strike out the words "six hundred and seventy-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert the words "seven hundred and three thousand two hundred and fifty."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for thirty-five men of class 1 and thirty-five men of class 2—

Mr. LITTAUER. If I may be allowed, the Commissioner advised us that we could reduce the number of clerks in the service, and this is in the line of his recommendation.

Mr. MANN. I thought this was an increase.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; it is a decrease.

Mr. LITTAUER. It is the elimination of seventy clerks. The committee reported to eliminate thirty-five at \$1,400 and thirty-five at \$1,200. The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate thirty-five out of the \$1,000 class and thirty-five out of the \$900 class instead of as at first proposed.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

No vacancy now existing in the clerical or other classified service of the Pension Office, or which may occur after March 1, 1907, and prior to July 1, 1908, shall be filled by original appointment or by transfer from any other office or bureau of the Department of the Interior. Nor shall any transfers from said Pension Office existing March 1, 1907, be returned to said Office.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 14, on page 115, strike out the words "or other classified," and in line 17 strike out the word "eight" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seven."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: For the Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of Commissioner as may be assigned to him by the Commissioner, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 3 examiners in chief, at \$3,000 each; examiner of interferences, \$2,500; examiner of trade-marks and designs, \$2,500; 41 principal examiners, at \$2,500 each; 53 first assistant examiners, at \$1,800 each; 63 second assistant examiners, at \$1,600 each; 73 third assistant examiners, at \$1,400 each; 83 fourth assistant examiners, at \$1,200 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; additional to 1 chief of division in charge of the Official Gazette, \$250; 3 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,800 each; 7 clerks of class 4, one of whom shall act as application clerk; machinist, \$1,600; 7 clerks of class 3, one of whom shall be translator of languages; 15 clerks of class 2; 70 clerks of class 1; skilled laborer, \$1,200; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 57 permanent clerks, at \$1,000 each; messenger and property clerk, \$1,000; 107 copyists, seven of whom may be copyists of drawings; 31 copyists, at \$720 each; 3 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; 51 laborers, at \$600 each; 50 laborers, at \$480 each; 39 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$956,880.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 118, in lines 2 and 3, strike out "machinist, \$1,000;" in line 8 strike out "fifty-seven" and insert "sixty-two;" and after the word "clerk" insert "including five heretofore designated model attendants;" in line 10 strike out "one hundred and seven" and insert "one hundred and six;" in line 11, after the word "drawings," insert "ten clerks heretofore designated model attendants, at \$800 each," and strike out "thirty-one" and insert "thirty;" in line 14 strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-eight;" and in lines 16 and 17 strike out "fifty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty-five thousand seven hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; confidential clerk to the Secretary, \$1,600; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary, \$1,800; chief clerk and superintendent, \$3,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; chief of appointment division, \$2,250; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; ten clerks of class 4 (including one census clerk); ten clerks of class 3; twelve clerks of class 2; ten clerks of class 1; ten clerks, at \$1,000 each; five clerks, at \$900 each; two telegraph operators, at \$1,200 each; five messengers; nine assistant messengers; seven messenger boys, at \$480 each; one engineer, \$1,000; one skilled laborer, \$840; two conductors of elevators, at \$720 each; two firemen, at \$660 each; nine laborers; one packer, \$840; one driver and foreman of stables, \$840; six hostlers, at \$660 each; one cabinetmaker, \$1,000; one carpenter, \$900; captain of the watch, \$1,200; six watchmen; fifteen charwomen; in all, \$151,840.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 15, on page 143, insert:

"For compensation of not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of the markets for cotton products, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Unless objection is made, I shall ask for a vote on that amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$750,000, not more than \$25,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of the markets for any one of the following articles:

Cotton and manufactures thereof, wool and manufactures thereof, leather and manufactures thereof, boots and shoes, wood and manufactures thereof, glass and manufactures thereof, iron and manufactures thereof, flax and manufactures thereof, steel and manufactures thereof, copper and manufactures thereof, automobiles, sewing machines, typewriters, firearms, hardware, cutlery, agricultural implements, corn, hay, wheat, potatoes, barley, tobacco, sugar, rice, cattle, eggs, swine, beets, onions; and the reports of such special agents shall be published by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the debate upon the substitute amendment first?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly in favor of that amendment. The usual appropriation was left out by the committee this year, of some \$50,000—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to raise the point of order on the substitute.

Several MEMBERS. That is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is too late, debate having been passed.

Mr. SULLIVAN. In the last bill \$50,000 was appropriated for the investigation of foreign markets, with a view of increasing the commerce of the United States. In the previous bill \$30,000 was carried, so that \$80,000 has been authorized and probably spent for the investigation of these markets. In order that the House may not think that all this has been without fruit, I hold up for your inspection all of the reports which have been made so far, and which represent the \$80,000 which has been expended. Here is the \$80,000 worth. I offer that as an exhibit, in order to indicate to the House how many more reports we might get, excellently written and in much greater bulk, if we should appropriate what I ask for, namely, \$750,000. And to show that there is an absolute need of appropriating this money, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the statement made by Mr. Carson, of the Department of Commerce and Labor. He speaks of the great and dense ignorance of the

American manufacturer concerning the conditions of trade in Europe and the rest of the world.

That is illustrated by this remark:

It is to exploit those facts and to inform our people as to the wants and requirements of foreign markets that our efforts are being directed. When made acquainted with these conditions our manufacturers and merchants will not send skates to the Tropics and fur goods to Jamaica.

Now, I suppose there are some merchants and manufacturers in the United States who know what the temperature of the Tropics is, but they never had a realizing sense of the facts until they were incorporated in an official statement. We all know that unofficial statements concerning trade conditions, such as are gathered by merchants and their agents, are of absolutely no value to men who have goods to sell, and that the only fact worth considering is the fact that is stated in a solemn document prepared under the auspices of one of the officials of the United States. So that hereafter as one result of the publication of these reports, which have cost \$80,000 already, we will understand officially that there is no ice in the Tropics upon which people of that country may skate and there is no necessity for fur cloaks and boas. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Is it necessary to have ice always in order to skate?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do not know what the conditions in the Tropics are, but I assure the gentleman it is not necessary in Chicago.

Mr. MANN. We know that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. It is a worthy purpose, Mr. Chairman, and if the money of the country is going to be spent, as I think it will be, there is no better way than to develop the foreign commerce of this country. For a great many years, under the influence of protective tariffs, the attention of our producers, of our farmers, and manufacturers was concentrated almost exclusively upon the home market. Now, having control of the home market in such manner as to call for such investigations as have been propounded here to-day—for instance, the investigation of the lumber trust—it now becomes necessary to turn our eyes away from local conditions and see what we may sell in the rest of the world. It is a subject that will take a long time to investigate, as the answer of Mr. Carson shows. He was asked by Mr. LITTAUER, of the committee:

How many years will it take to complete this investigation?

Mr. CARSON. You will find in these reports [handing to members of the committee printed reports] the kind of work we are doing.

Then Mr. LITTAUER proceeded:

Mr. Carson, here you have special agents whose object is the extension of the foreign commerce of the United States. Of course the field is almost unlimited, is it not?

Mr. CARSON. Yes; it is without limit.

So we have the assurance that if this beneficent work is continued in a manner befitting the dignity and glory of this great American nation that it will last for all time and consume a considerable portion of the public revenues. I for one should much prefer to see the money of the country spent in the development of our foreign commerce than spent in building a great navy or maintaining a great standing army. I should prefer to see much of it spent in the development of our rivers and harbors, and in the same line of reasoning considerable money could be well spent in the development of our foreign commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Now, I know that some Member who objects to the expenditure of such a large sum as three-quarters of a million dollars for this excellent purpose may say that these special agents are not of any value to the country. The contradiction is found here. Here are the reports. They speak for themselves. They are excellently written, some of them by skilled newspaper men, who have found a great deal of material worth reporting and who have compiled it in a most excellent fashion. I know that some men will say these men ought to be experts in particular lines, and no others should be appointed, but if you have experts in the manufacture of cotton and other articles you will not have such beautiful and finished literary productions as you will when you send newspaper men abroad to do this work, and that is something which should merit the consideration of the House.

I know that some men will object still further and say that much of the information gathered by these special agents, for which I trust we will appropriate \$750,000 more, is material that could be just as well collected by the members of our con-

sular service, and they will argue that the consular service has recently been improved, or is about to be improved, as a result of the excellent legislation of last year. I grant that. I believe it is a fact, accepted by all, that when special agents do go abroad the first thing they do is to consult the resident consul in the particular district which they are exploring and get from him all the information he has upon the subject. But the fact still remains that these consuls can not make reports of such literary excellence as our special agents, and for that reason I think this work ought to be continued.

Now, then, I do not believe that cotton should be singled out for the expenditure of a large sum of money, and I have extended the list so that it includes thirty articles, all of them produced in the United States and equally entitled to the protection of the American flag and to an appropriation. No one can say upon this floor with any degree of confidence that we ought to spend the money of the country for the development of the market for cotton or boots and shoes exclusively. A Member has suggested, after hearing my list read, that I showed a great lack of local pride in failing to insert in my list the item of Boston baked beans. [Laughter.] He said that that was an article which should be sent abroad, and which undoubtedly would improve conditions in the world generally outside of the United States and in the city of Boston in particular. But in order that I might not be accused of any selfish local pride, I omitted that important article from my list and devoted my attention to some things equally meritorious.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell the committee how much money the Government of the United States has been spending in this magnificent work?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thirty thousand dollars in the bill the year before last and \$50,000 last year.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What would you call this agent that you speak of? A drummer?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would call him the "advance agent of prosperity." [Laughter.] He is sent abroad in order to ascertain conditions—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All the drummers are that. I never saw a drummer in my life that did not think that prosperity was ahead of him or just behind him.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are called "special agents" in the bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Special agents of whom? Some private firm?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] asks for five minutes more. Is there objection. There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does this gentleman represent the Government of the United States as such or some private firm?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The gentleman represents the Government of the United States in general and the Treasury of the United States in particular. The information which he collects is, of course, published to the world, and our manufacturers get the benefit of it. I have not observed, as a result of these investigations, that our commerce has increased materially; but the work is still young. It is still only an infant industry, and it ought to get proper encouragement. In process of time it will unquestionably show the merits of the enterprise.

Now, I have asked twenty-five thousand for boots and shoes, which are articles of great importance all the world over. The people of the world are entitled to know the merits of American-made boots and shoes. And so on through wood and its manufactures, and sewing machines, typewriters, firearms, hardware, cutlery, and also a great many products of the farm. I find, for example, that corn leads the list in the last year's production. Corn is an article of even greater value in the domestic economy of the United States than cotton. I find that the production of corn is twelve hundred and sixteen millions according to the last report. Then, too, hay is ahead of cotton, the value being six hundred and five millions. Cotton comes third, with five hundred and seventy-five millions, and wheat follows a close fourth, with five hundred and twenty-five millions, and oats, two hundred and eighty-two millions, and so on. I have put all of these worthy and deserving articles in the list because I believe they are entitled to consideration equally with cotton. I would not neglect other articles. Take the American hog, for example. He is finding it extremely difficult to enter the markets of Europe, particularly of Germany. All sorts of discriminating laws are made against him. What could be better than to have

expert agents of the United States go to Germany and find out how conditions might be improved, so as to facilitate the entrance—I might say, grease the passage—of the American hog, so that the sale of hog products might be greater in Germany than it is to-day. [Laughter.] Then there are other articles of the farm. Take beets, for example. Why should not the American beet be extolled abroad by our agents?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are paying three millions now to send it abroad.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Let us pay more. If it is a good thing, we can not have too much of it. Then take the onion. There is a patient and humble American vegetable just as much entitled, in my judgment, to the protection of the flag and as much entitled to an appropriation as is cotton. What patriot is there who can not feel the rush of blood to his face and moisture to his eyes when he speaks of the American onion? [Laughter.] Would it not sweeten Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world in its passage around the globe? What more patriotic mission could there be than to send a special agent abroad with the American flag in his right hand and the American onion in his left hand? [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. What about the hen?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; what about the hen? I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I find that the Secretary of Agriculture has stated in a solemn document that "the farmer's hen has become a worthy companion to his cow. The annual production of eggs is now a score of billions." There is the egg industry. See that we send an agent abroad to find a market for our eggs, and even for our decayed eggs. Why, it was rumored not long ago that they were treated with formaldehyde, put in barrels, and sent to China.

I remember some years ago an American actor, speaking of eyewater, said that he could buy it at 50 cents a barrel and sell it in China at a dollar a bottle, and that there were "millions in it." There are millions in this also. So our decayed-egg industry should be fostered. Why not find a legitimate outlet for the decayed eggs, instead of allowing them to remain a sort of fluid criticism upon American dramatic art? [Laughter.] Who can not see the picture of the Orient waiting with outstretched arms and, perhaps, bowed head, calling for the introduction of the decayed eggs of the United States? I might extend the list indefinitely, but I assure gentlemen this amendment ought to pass, in the interest of American industries. There is not one of these articles which could be called unpatriotic; not one of them but which is entitled to an appropriation as much as cotton and other articles which are specifically enumerated. Let these agents be appointed; let the appropriation go on, and after a while, under the civilizing influence of our beets, our onions, and our decayed eggs, we will not find it necessary longer to appropriate for great navies; we will have conquered the world with our products; and therefore I beg a respectful consideration by this House for this amendment. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, from first to last, the remarks of my colleague on the committee have been quite unkind, in attempting to ridicule this amendment of mine off the floor of the House. Ridicule is not argument. It may be in harmony with his practice before petty juries in the courtroom, but is not worth anything on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, over half of the articles he mentions are already exploited abroad by special appropriations. Beef, mutton, butter, corn and corn bread, hen and hen fruit, and all that, have been cared for by the Secretary of Agriculture to a very great extent, and a product of this country which for the last five years—three out of five—has paid the balance in export trade against the United States is cotton. It has been settled by cotton, and the money furnished to prevent a financial panic in the United States, yet he compares that product to the juice from rotten eggs [laughter]—another Massachusetts product [laughter]—and Boston beans.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would share its benefit with the whole world; I was not so selfish as the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee, in the preparation of this bill, saw proper to put in an appropriation for, or recommendation for, \$30,000 this year. Now, the gentleman can still, if the limit is put back in the bill and the amendment prevails, can still go to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor with this list and have them all attended to.

Mr. SULLIVAN. There would not be enough money.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This law was \$30,000 last year; the current appropriation is \$50,000. But \$20,000 was added by an amendment in the Senate covering cotton products; and I am going to show you who are interested in cotton products, and you ought to take care of it. All I have asked is a reinstatement of the current law in the bill. Now, why should that

amendment of mine be attacked as if it was a scheme, if you wish to call it a scheme, as the gentleman from Boston seems to think it is. It is not giving a fair chance to the tax payer of the United States as to whether it is proper to be expended in this way or not. The gentleman holds up in his hand a great body of reports of the special agents, and does not show how the expenditure of \$80,000 has benefited this country.

I say that if you will read these reports you will see that our special agents, sent abroad to enlarge and broaden the trade of this country, have been very efficient and useful.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman particularize?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Another Boston man. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I had more than ten or fifteen minutes I would take these reports and particularize, but the gentleman from New York knew that no man could do it under the five-minute rule when he put the proposition up to me. I say this appropriation ought to be continued, so as to give this scheme, if you call it a scheme, a fair deal. I stand in my place on the floor of this House and declare that these reports sustain the argument I am making, without particularizing, and I leave it with the gentleman from New York, if he can get the time, to particularize.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask unanimous consent for ten minutes in order to make me even up with the Boston party.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, let us see about the necessity. I shall have to be brief about it. We produce 70 per cent of the raw cotton of the world. England produces 64 per cent of the cotton fabrics of the world. I have not the time to dwell on that. Let me repeat it, and you take it home with you. We produce in the United States 70 per cent of all the raw cotton of the world. England produces 64 per cent of all the cotton goods of the world. England exports annually \$447,657,600 of cotton fabrics. The United States, that produces 70 per cent of the raw cotton, sends abroad \$55,189,700 in cotton goods; \$55,000,000 against \$447,000,000. Is it not about time that Asia and Africa knew that we have cotton and cotton mills in this country, and can manufacture and sell cotton goods cheaper than England? That is the object of this amendment.

Listen! In 1905 England sold to Asia \$202,212,600 worth of cotton goods. The United States sold in Asia only \$36,988,200 worth of manufactured cotton. There were \$36,000,000 of our cotton fabrics going to Asia against \$202,000,000 of English goods going to Asia. How did they get that trade? By doing just what I propose in this amendment. That is how they got it, they went after it like the nigger went after the Christmas turkey. He got it because he went after it.

Again, Africa took from England last year \$29,456,100 in cotton goods, and she took from us \$428,200. There is a difference of \$29,000,000 that Africa took from England more than she took from us. South America, right at our doors, took from England last year \$32,002,800, and took from us \$3,476,500, a difference of \$28,000,000 that England sold right at our doors more than we sold of manufactured cotton goods. Canada and Mexico took from England five times as much cotton goods as they took from the United States in 1905. Think of it. Mexico on our south Canada on our north, and both on our borders, took five times as much manufactured cotton from England as from the United States. Let any man look at these figures, which are all official, and he will see that when we have one crop worth from five to six hundred million dollars, and only a small per cent of it manufactured within the limits of the United States and 64 per cent of it manufactured in England—if any man looking at this fact will tell me that it is not time for the United States to get a part of that trade or all of it, then I am mistaken in the man. He must be from Boston. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, when I offered that amendment I intended to insert three words between "cotton" and the word "products," and those words were "and cotton-seed;" but knowing the amendments the gentlemen had to propose, and knowing them to be outside of the current law, I refrained, because it would open the gates to the gentleman from Boston, and to every other gentleman, to put into the current law foolish, ridiculous amendments such as my friend from Boston has proposed here to-day. I ask for nothing except the current law.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Does not your amendment provide specifically for the investigation of trade conditions and

the extension of the trade of the United States in other products besides cotton and its manufactures?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say that there is \$30,000 that absolutely covers the very articles mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. That is the point, and only \$20,000 of the \$50,000 goes for the investigation and extension of the cotton trade in foreign markets.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I desire in the time allowed me to give my hearty indorsement to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. The effort, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] makes in regard to this question in opposition to the desired appropriation is to use the shaft of ridicule. That always reacts against a man who attempts to use it on a subject as grave and of such magnitude as this. The gentleman from Massachusetts certainly does not know, and if he does know he can not appreciate it, that for this one product, for this one staple of cotton, Europe pays us annually more than all the gold developed and mined annually in the world. It is true that this enormous amount for one staple goes into the lap of the South.

And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] stands here in the presence of this House and facetiously and flippantly compares this gigantic article of the world's commerce with "rotten eggs" and "onions." Does he know, Mr. Chairman, when he talks in this spirit of idle ridicule, that every day, including Sundays and holidays, Great Britain for our raw cotton is paying the cotton producer of the United States more than \$1,000,000? And yet his purpose, in an effort to display his native wit, is to underestimate and belittle, if you please, this great southern product that is destined in the development of the South to clothe the people of all the world who wear clothes and are civilized. I have thought, among Democrats and Republicans, regardless of place of residence, the sentiment prevailed that we should expand and extend our trade with foreign countries.

No man on the floor of this House is more in favor of such a policy than I am. Why not prepare to meet the inevitable demands of the world for cotton cloth? We are bound to have an outlet for this great and valuable crop. The Eastern States as well as the Southern States are alike interested in the manufacture of cotton. It is true the South produces quite 80 per cent of the raw cotton that supplies the world, and the South, to the amazement of the world, is now manufacturing about one-half of the cloth manufactured in the United States. Great sections of the world await the new exportation and the extension of our cotton-fabric trade.

There stands China, with more than 450,000,000 of people, awaiting to-day the cotton cloth and clothing which is the joint product of the mills of the South and East. We see that Great Britain buys from us raw cotton, manufacturing it, and by tactful methods in foreign countries governs that great trade throughout the world that the United States ought to-day to control and will control in the near future if we will be broad enough to give our cotton a fair chance. There stands Japan, a great, growing, and aspiring country that has recently entered on the stage of the great nations of the world, with 45,000,000 of people who can use our cotton. Great Britain is extending the tentacles of her trade greed and will soon have in her grasp the cotton-cloth interests and demands of that people. It is the proper time for us to seek this developing trade in Japan. If we lose it, the completion of the Panama Canal will lose many of its commercial advantages for the South. Let us understand the proposition submitted to us and then apply the wit and humor in the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is this: The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] moves to reinsert in the bill the provision that calls for an appropriation of \$50,000 "to investigate trade conditions abroad," to promote our foreign commerce, but only \$20,000 of this amount shall be used to investigate foreign markets in the interest of cotton products. It appears that the \$30,000 appropriation ought to be sufficient to investigate foreign markets in the interest of "rotten eggs and onions."

Why, Mr. Chairman, there can be no comparison with any one single product that is made in the United States to this great one of the product of cotton and its manufacture. I insist, Mr. Chairman, not in any spirit of sectionalism, not in any spirit except that which is broad and patriotic, that we ought to investigate matters of this kind, for such investigations will add to the commercial growth of our Republic. We ought to send skilled and trained men to these markets that we can develop—men who can tell us what the existing conditions are, what the customs are, and what kind and character of cotton

cloths we ought to send to that country and what kind would suit the tastes of those people, so that it will increase and advance our trade there. I insist that the provision offered by the gentleman from Georgia should be reinserted in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, of course the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] will be voted down, because it was offered for the purpose of being voted down. But I do sincerely hope the members of this committee will not treat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] with ridicule. It is entitled to serious consideration, and when you come to vote upon it, and you will do so, if you vote down a substitute which will later be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] it is my purpose to offer an amendment to the amendment, adding after the words "cotton products" the words "and cotton-seed products."

The amendment as amended would then read as follows:

For compensation, at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses, of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products and cotton-seed products, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

I can give reasons why I think the amendment as amended should go into this bill, and these reasons are not at all inconsistent with the views expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I concur generally in the propositions laid down by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] that it is the duty of the consular officers to develop the trade of the United States. I recognize that the service of each of our consular officers, regardless of the State from which he is appointed, belongs alike to all the States, but at the same time I submit in all fairness that each section should be given a just and fair proportion of these appointments, in order that we may have those in our consular service who are thoroughly familiar with the resources and industries of the various sections of our country.

I also contend that these consular officers from the different sections should be stationed in those countries with which the citizens of the particular section have established trade relations or where there is a hope of developing or extending their trade. 'Tis true a consular officer is a commercial agent whose duty it is to advance the commercial interests of the country he represents and of the individual citizen of the country he represents, but to do so we all will admit he must have a particular knowledge of the industry which he endeavors to promote, and it is for that very reason that I urge upon the committee to put this item in this bill. Now, why?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Agreeing with the gentleman as to the appropriation, I would like to ask him this question: How is it possible for the special agents appointed to differentiate between the work they do for cotton, cotton seed, and cotton fabrics and the work they do for other items, each one being engaged in a country by itself, observing the trade relations of that country, and making a general report upon the trade of that country?

Mr. BURLESON. I suppose agents will be appointed who are thoroughly familiar with the cotton-seed oil industry and who know something about where additional markets for the same could probably be found. It is to secure such services, which can not be rendered by our present consular officers, that I contend for the continuance of this appropriation. Mr. Chairman, that is the very reason why this item ought to go into this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will just state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there were two men specially appointed for cotton, and they did not mix up with anything else.

Mr. BURLESON. I do not want my time consumed by further interruption, because my time is limited and I have several suggestions which I desire to offer this committee in support of this item. As a matter of fact—and I do not say this now in a partisan sense; I desire to emphasize the assurance that I am not stating what I now propose to state in a partisan sense—as a matter of fact, there is not to-day a consular officer in the service of the United States who knows anything whatever about the manufacture of cotton-seed products, who is located where there is even a remote chance to widen a market for same or aid in extending its uses or assist in increasing a demand for same. The truth is we have for the entire eleven Southern States, the cotton and cotton-seed oil producing States, only fourteen consular officers—fourteen for that entire section, while Massachusetts alone has nineteen.

And, Mr. Chairman, the fourteen consular officers who have been selected from the cotton States have been sent to obscure points in Central or South America, or Bergen, Norway, or some other point with which the great agricultural South has no trade relations. I will admit that it is the duty of our consular officer who hails from Massachusetts (many of whom are stationed in Europe, where the cotton and cotton-seed oil interests are important) to further the commercial interest of the South and the commercial interests of the individual citizens of that section; but, Mr. Chairman, this they can not properly do. They might, as far as cotton products are concerned, but I assert they can not so do with reference to cotton-seed products, for they are wanting in knowledge of the industry.

I do not mean to reflect upon our consular officers. Of course they represent all parts and all interests of the United States. I believe they are the best in the world, but those in Europe, where this great interest is involved, have no knowledge of cotton-seed products, and consequently can not represent its merits. New York can oppose this, but it is not becoming in her Representatives to do so, because New York has thirty-seven of her citizens abroad as consular officers to represent the commercial interests of that State, to exploit the manufactured wares of that great Commonwealth, and they do it, and do it well, and I am glad of it; but why should she now oppose this item which affects the great staple crop of the South?

Mr. Chairman, can I be excused if I take one moment to speak of the value of the great staple to be affected by this amendment? It is undoubtedly true that cotton is the most important crop grown in all this great country. But for this crop, instead of being one of the leading, if not the leading, creditor countries of the world, we would, when the balance of the world's trade is struck, find ourselves each year on the wrong side of the ledger. This great crop furnishes full 90 per cent of the balance of trade in our favor. The hoard of gold now piled high in the vaults of our Treasury bears silent witness to the service rendered by cotton in bringing this precious metal from foreign shores.

Mr. Chairman, millions of dollars are appropriated each year for the support of our consular service, and, as I have shown, of the 300 consular officers all the South has only 14, and these are located where they can be of but little service, and now, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] by this amendment asks for the pitiful sum of \$20,000 to exploit a by-product of its great crop, of which no consular officer, located where its interests are affected, now in the service of the United States knows one single thing, he is met with ridicule—with ridicule by a gentleman who hails from Massachusetts, a State that has in our consular service five more representatives than are to be found in the entire eleven States interested in this product.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly. I have no objection, if my time can be extended to enable me to conclude what I desire to say on this subject.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if these officials coming from Massachusetts and New York, or any of them, were appointed to represent any particular industry?

Mr. BURLESON. Not at all. On the contrary, I disclaimed that they were there to represent particularly the wares of New York, but at the same time, being from New York, I say that they are thoroughly familiar with the wares of New York and thus splendidly equipped to promote her commercial interests.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why should we appoint anyone to represent any particular industry, cotton or any other?

Mr. BURLESON. I have not so contended, as a general proposition, and if the gentleman had given attention to what I have stated he would not have consumed my time by asking such a question or interjecting such a statement. I have clearly announced that it is the duty of our consular officers to represent every section, and every interest of every section, of the United States, and I have also said they were doing it as well as they could. But, Mr. Chairman, our consuls located in Europe do not have a proper knowledge of this industry because of conditions I have described, and for that reason we are asking that \$20,000 be set apart to exploit this particular industry, and we found our contention upon the broad basis of right. We have a right to ask it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for a few moments longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, this is a peculiar industry—the cotton-seed-oil industry. No consular officer living be-

yond the limits of the South can possibly have that knowledge of it which will enable him to properly represent its merits. It has heretofore found its principal, if not its sole, market in Europe, or rather, I should say, in certain countries in Europe—England, France, Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. We have no consular officer there with even fair knowledge of it. This is one reason why I contend that this item should go into this bill.

This industry now has \$73,000,000 invested in it and 715 different plants engaged in its manufacture. Last year the product was excluded from Austria by a prohibitive tax. It has been practically excluded from Germany, and now France threatens to exclude it. Recent cablegrams from Paris clearly indicate a purpose on the part of the customs committee of the Chamber of Deputies to increase the tariff charge on cotton seed and cotton-seed oil to so high a figure that it would amount to exclusion. So imminent is this danger that the ambassador from this country to France, Mr. McCormick, has made strong representations against the proposed increase.

Mr. Chairman, as is well known to us all, a very advantageous reciprocity treaty which had been negotiated with France by Mr. Kasson, under the provisions of the Dingley Act, was pigeonholed at the other end of the Capitol. That treaty, it is believed, would have proven especially advantageous to the cotton producer. In fact, it is claimed that it would have been worth millions of dollars to those interested in that great staple. But, Mr. Chairman, we did not get it, and we all know we will not get a reciprocity treaty with France. The particular treaty was sidetracked, so it is said, because it happened to affect very slightly certain knitted goods manufactured in Massachusetts. Such being the case, regardless of the enormous benefit to be conferred on the millions who produce cotton and cotton seed, a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts saw that the treaty was not ratified.

I am not making any complaint about it. That matter is passed, but I do believe it my duty to insist that because the interests of this product are being sidetracked in this way that we are entitled to ask of the Congress the pittance carried in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

It is now our only hope of accomplishing anything for this industry, for not only have we failed in the past to secure relief through reciprocity, but there is no hope of doing anything along that line in the future.

The reciprocity bureau of the State Department has been abandoned, and evidently there is no purpose to attempt anything further in that direction.

I submit in this connection a part of the hearings on this bill before your Appropriation Committee and you can determine for yourself the chances for action from that quarter. I read from the statement made by the honorable Secretary of State:

LACK OF EXPERT ASSISTANCE.

Secretary Root. There is particularly a lack of force in what we call the bureau of trade relations. You will remember that there was a reciprocity bureau, and that when I talked with you a year ago we talked about the expenses of the reciprocity bureau, of which Mr. Kasson had been the head, and of which Mr. Coleman was secretary and practical chief under Mr. Kasson. That is gone now. That expense had been paid out of an emergency fund, and we abandoned that in the process of reforming our salaries, with general consent.

There is a great amount of work to be done—work that we have got to have done in the State Department. It is part of a pretty wide subject, and I do not know that I ought to take up your time with it, but it may be worth while for me to say a few words. We are very lame and very undeveloped in our governmental organization in respect to expert assistance. We have just sent over to Germany, for the purpose of reaching an understanding upon facts and an understanding of the relative ideas of the two countries on the subject of the tariff, three experts, and I had to go around and pick them up and get them as a matter of special favor from the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce, and we have added a consul-general—Mr. Mason—who has gone over to Berlin from Paris to give them the benefit of his assistance. They met in Berlin a force of nine experts connected with the foreign office, whose entire and continuous business is to keep the Government of Germany up to date all the time upon every commercial question.

Mr. LITTAUER. You have not a like force in your Department?

Secretary Root. There is no such force here.

Mr. BURLESON. Is there any necessity for such a force? Germany is constantly engaged in negotiating reciprocity treaties with various countries. That is the very character of business they are engaged in. They are the experts about whom Secretary Root speaks.

Secretary Root. We are exporting \$1,750,000,000 worth of goods, and all of those except those going to Great Britain herself are going to countries that have tariffs imposed upon our goods, and there is no country in the world that so much needs intelligent and expert knowledge on all tariff questions as this country now, at this very time.

Mr. LITTAUER. Tariff questions from the standpoint of those countries we are dealing with?

Secretary Root. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. To do what, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Root. To enable us, in the first place, to make the necessary representations to those countries which will prevent their imposing disadvantages upon our trade—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And crippling it?

Secretary Root. Yes; crippling our trade. Changes are being proposed all the time all over—changes in France, changes in Germany,

changes in Brazil, changes everywhere in the tariff. Our commercial competitors are trying to get changes made that will help them and hurt us all the time. We have got to look out for it every day in the week, and somebody has got to know something about the subject.

Mr. TAWNEY. To what extent, if at all, has the Treasury Department performed this service in the past?

Secretary Root. I do not suppose to any considerable extent. It has been left to the State Department, which did not have any experts who were familiar with the subject. I have only answered a single question about trying to prevent injury. Another thing is to try to get changes made in their tariffs that will benefit us.

We have just got, incidental to a little cultivation of kindly feeling with South America, a reduction of the Brazilian duties on our flour. They gave us a 20 per cent differential, a rate 20 per cent lower to us on our flour than on the flour imported from other countries.

Mr. BURLESON. Can we obtain favors of that character without granting similar concessions?

Secretary Root. We have just done it.

Mr. BURLESON. What character of favor?

Secretary Root. A reduction of 20 per cent in the duty on flour with Brazil.

Mr. BURLESON. Without granting any concessions ourselves?

Secretary Root. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not fair to say that coffee, the chief and almost sole importation of that country, Brazil, comes to this country free? That is the reason we are able to make negotiations of that kind.

Secretary Root. Of course. But an understanding of that situation—that is a simple situation—an understanding of it is necessary on our part if we are to have such a concession on their part. We have now, under the third section of the Dingley Act, authority to reduce the duties on distilled spirits, argols, and wines coming from foreign countries, for a consideration, and propositions for that are always on the tapis here. We are making such arrangements from time to time. We have got to know. Other countries are making proposals to us for reciprocity treaties, just as Germany has a proposal pending now. We can not throw a proposition of that kind out of the window.

Mr. BURLESON. I will admit the crying necessity of these experts if you are going to engage in that policy.

Secretary Root. Whatever the policy may be, we have got to engage in the policy of treating foreign countries with consideration and courtesy, and when they come to us and say, "We want to make a reciprocity treaty" and "The tariff arrangements with us are not fair," we have got to listen to them and discuss the subject with them, and we have got to have somebody who knows something about it.

Mr. BURLESON. It does not take any expert knowledge to give them a polite answer and to say that it is not the policy of the United States to do that. Is not that the situation?

Secretary Root. It is not a situation that the Secretary of State is entitled to announce. We have got to deal with each situation by itself as it occurs.

Mr. Chairman, I have had many requests from those interested in this industry for legislation of the character proposed in this amendment. I believe that it is not alone to the interest of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton-seed oil, many of whom reside in my district, but I am sure it is in the interest of every man who grows cotton.

For a number of years the cotton planter has not received what I would regard as a fair price per ton for his cotton seed. It has been thought that this might have been brought about by a common understanding or secret agreement entered into by the cotton-seed oil people, but it may be the fact that markets abroad are being closed against the cotton-seed oil that has made it impossible for the manufacturer of cotton-seed oil to pay a higher price for his raw material. If this be true, and by this small sum relief can be afforded, undoubtedly it should be allowed.

Twenty thousand dollars is all that is asked. I have tried to show you why we should have these special agents. I do not believe that our consular agents can properly serve those interested in this industry, and when I say that I do not mean it in any sense as a criticism of them. I say it in the face of the condition that confronts us, and every man here knows that it confronts us. I will not now discuss why we have not more consular agents from the South or the reasons why they are assigned to duty at obscure places. That is neither here nor there. I am not making any complaint about that at this time, but I do say if you want to do right, and accord even-handed justice, you will not deny this \$20,000 when millions are carried in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for the support of consular officers who look after the trade in other sections of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will detain the House only a short time. I shall not make any extended remarks, but I simply want to say that I agree most heartily with what the gentleman from Texas has said, that this effort to widen the markets of the United States for the sale of cotton goods is not a proper subject of ridicule on the part of the gentleman from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any other Member. We to-day in the South are competing with Massachusetts and New England in the manufacture of cotton goods. The cotton growers of the South have also become cotton spinners.

North Carolina ranks as the third State of the Union in the manufacture of cotton goods. Massachusetts comes first, South Carolina second, and the great State of North Carolina, which I have the honor in part to represent, comes third in the manufac-

ture of cotton goods. The climate, water power, and labor in my State all unite to make the State a great manufacturing State. This amendment simply proposes, gentlemen of the House, to investigate trade conditions generally as to every article of manufacture and every product of this country sold in foreign markets. It proposes that there shall be an investigation as to trade conditions in cotton manufactures with a view to widening the markets of the United States for cotton and cotton manufactures. It appropriates \$50,000 for the employment of special agents to do this work, of which sum \$20,000 only is to be expended with a view of widening our foreign markets for cotton manufactures. I believe that would be money wisely expended, and differ wholly with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Is this sum not insignificant compared with the value of this great product of the South; this great money crop of the South? And as the gentleman from Texas has well said, there is linked with cotton and cotton manufactures also the great cotton-seed oil industry, which has grown, as I have shown in my former speech in the House, from a few hundred thousand dollars in value and investment to millions of dollars in value. We want to devise some means to get new and wider foreign markets for that great industry of the South. What was once a waste product which brought no money to the South has grown into a great industry with millions of dollars invested.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. LITTAUER. Was this waste product turned into millions of dollars of profit to the people of the South by any sort of reports of this character obtained through this appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. No. It was due to the energy of the people of the South and the fact that they possessed this raw product; but of course they get suggestions from reports and investigations as to the best markets and means of increasing the price and widening the markets for the product. I will say to the gentleman from New York as the gentleman from Texas has well said, and as I have shown in my former speeches, inasmuch as we have been unable to get reciprocity treaties we want at least to have some method or means by which we can widen the markets of the South and the United States for this cotton-seed oil product as well as our cotton manufactures. It means much to that great section of our reunited country—the Southland.

Mr. LITTAUER. Can you point to any single item in the reports already made from the expenditure of the \$30,000 for the year ending the 30th of July last or the supplemental \$50,000 that is now being expended the promotion of which is in any way attributable to that appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Well, I am not familiar with the reports, but, in a general way, I should say that the expenditure of this money—the sending of special agents abroad for the purpose of investigating trade conditions to extend the markets of the United States for all its manufactures and products, especially for cotton manufactures, throwing all possible light upon the subject—must necessarily tend to promote the widening of our markets, enabling us to know where and how to carry on our trade to the best advantage. We have been told one advantage of holding the Philippines is that they may be a base for our trade in cotton manufactures in the Orient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to put in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Southern States Commissioners of Agriculture and Agricultural Workers sent me to-day by Doctor Kilgore, of the North Carolina department of agriculture. I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina desires to print in the RECORD the matter to which he has referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter above referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION.

Whereas cotton is the principal money crop of the South; that this will continue to be so for years to come is a matter about which there can be no difference of opinion. We note with a degree of great satisfaction that the United States Congress at its last session appropriated a small sum to be used in the commendable work of extending the market in foreign fields: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Southern States Commissioners of Agriculture and Agricultural Workers, in eighth annual session convened in the city of Jacksonville, Fla., take advantage of this, the first opportunity, to express our appreciation of the recognition given our greatest crop, and heartily commend the good work undertaken for the benefit of the cotton planter and the manufacturer, and urge our southern Congressmen and Senators to use every effort to secure adequate appropriations for the active continuation of this work.

Respectfully submitted.

H. E. BLAKESLEE, Commissioner for Mississippi,
T. H. HUDSON, Commissioner for Georgia,
TAITE BUTLER, Veterinarian for North Carolina,
Committee.

Adopted at adjourned session held at Tampa, Fla., Wednesday, November 21, 1906.

E. J. WATSON, President.

Attest:

B. W. KILGORE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has offered the following amendment:

For compensation, at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses, of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products; and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

I had prepared to offer the same amendment, and it is in the language of the current law as contained in the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. It has been of great benefit and valuable results have been obtained from it, and I hope it will be continued.

Under this appropriation investigations have been made by experts abroad, especially in China and other foreign countries, whose people use, to a great extent, cotton goods for clothing and other domestic purposes, and the results are contained and have been made known to us by the Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures, and they are, and will continue to be, of great benefit to our people, especially to the producers of cotton and its products. The sum proposed is so insignificant in comparison with the benefits that have been received, and will continue to be received, that it is surprising that anyone should oppose it.

The Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures, in his report, says:

WORK OF SPECIAL AGENTS.

Under the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the year 1906 the sum of \$30,000 was appropriated for an investigation of trade conditions abroad. Under this authority four special agents were appointed, one of whom was assigned to Canada, Mexico, and Cuba; one to Central and South America, and two to China and Japan. These officers not only furnished the country with valuable reports describing fully trade conditions and pointing out opportunities that invited American competition, but supplied other information of a practical character conveying object lessons to manufacturers, especially those of cotton goods, that has been productive of good results, and which has received the highest commendation from many of those whose interests were thus served. Under the appropriation act for the year 1907 the sum of \$50,000 is appropriated for continuing the investigation of trade conditions abroad, of which sum \$20,000 is provided for an inquiry into the markets for cotton products. Under this general authority investigation of foreign markets is being continued. Two experts in the manufacture of cotton goods, who were recommended very generally by manufacturers of such goods throughout the country, were appointed and have been engaged in that special work since July 1, 1906. Investigation by men trained in particular fields of activity, whose mental equipment has been supplemented by practical application, possessing in addition to these basic qualifications zeal to prosecute and ability to describe results of their investigations, can not fail to be highly valuable to the country and advantageous to the special interests that are served. Numerous letters have reached the Bureau from representative men in a number of the leading industries urging that investigation be made of markets for the promotion of their products through the agency of experts, as in the case of manufactures of cotton. It is recommended that the attention of the Congress be invited to this matter, and that provision be made for extending investigations abroad in special fields.

Referring to the markets for cotton products, he says:

EXTENT OF VALUE OF COTTON-CLOTH MARKETS.

The cotton piece-goods trade of China is one of large extent and is constantly growing. For the year 1905 the value of such cloths exported to China and Hongkong by Great Britain was \$49,625,000, a large proportion of which was composed of printed goods. For the year ended June 30, 1905, the value of cotton piece goods exported to China from the United States was \$27,761,000, out of a total exportation for the year of \$41,320,000, and for the fiscal year 1906 we sold to China \$29,641,200 of cotton cloths out of a total for the year of \$43,182,000. It will be observed that the exports of cotton cloths from Great Britain to China alone for 1905 were greater than those of the United States to all countries for that period. The figures of the cotton trade of Great Britain and the United States with South America show a much greater disparity than the figures for China. The entire value of shipments of cotton piece goods from the United States to South America for the year ended June 30, 1906, was \$3,246,567, while the shipments of Great Britain for the six months ended June 30, 1906, were valued at nearly \$18,000,000 and for the ten months ended October, 1906, at nearly \$32,000,000. To Argentine alone Great Britain in the six months ended with June, 1906, sold about \$7,000,000 worth of cotton piece goods, or twice as much as the United States sold for the entire fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, to all the countries of South America.

There seems to be no reason why the United States should not dispose of a large quantity of cotton printed goods and increase the sale of plain goods in the Orient, and reports of all observers agree that this can be done if our manufacturers will consult the conditions of the market, the requirements of the trade, the methods of doing business, and the tastes and desires of the people, and adjust their business to those conditions. The samples of printed goods sent by the special agents of the Department from China, accompanied by elaborate descriptions and explanations, were a revelation to our manufacturers and clearly established that these goods can be produced in the United States and sold in China in successful competition with those of European manufacturers.

The special agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor appointed to carry out the provisions of the present law, for which this appropriation was made by Congress, in a report which has been published, and which I have, show that there

is a growing demand for cotton and cotton goods in both north and south China, and that the American manufacturer can find an increasing market there, provided he can be informed in a well-defined way of the needs of the market. Not only is the foreign trade in cotton and cotton manufactures of great importance, but the cotton-seed industry and the products of cotton seed, most of which in former years was thrown away, have become one of the greatest industries in the country, especially in the South, where cotton is raised, until now products of the value of \$100,000,000 a year are produced from cotton seed, of which thirty million and odd dollars was exported this year, increasing from \$13,000,000 in 1897 to \$31,000,000 and over in 1906.

It may well be said that the cotton industry—the production of raw cotton and the manufactured products from the raw material and other by-products—is not only the greatest and most valuable industry in the United States, but in the world. This statement can not be answered by ridicule or comparison of the great staple product of the South, which produces this great wealth for the country and the world, with other insignificant products of the United States, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] has undertaken to do. Two-thirds of the raw material of cotton raised by the Southern States, which is the cotton-producing country of the world, is exported, to be converted by England, Germany, France, and other nations, into manufactured goods for the clothing of the world. But more than that, this great staple crop of the South has brought into the United States untold millions of foreign gold, and through it has not only made the South prosperous, but the entire country. In 1905 the value of raw cotton exported and the by-products of cotton, other than goods manufactured from cotton, brought into the United States \$380,000,000 of the \$400,000,000 of excess of exports over imports for that year. This great staple agricultural product of the South produces annually all of this excess except about \$20,000,000. In five years the cotton crop and its by-products from seed amounted in value to \$2,974,000,000, which was \$400,000,000 more than the entire output of gold and silver of the world for those years. So that this small sum asked for by this amendment is to be expended not simply to aid the farmers and manufacturers of the South, but to aid the entire United States, which but for this great staple product of our farms would not to-day enjoy the prosperity that it does.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the reports, not those made by one of our consular agents, but of the special agents appointed under the appropriation made last year to make these investigations, and I hold in my hand the summarized report of the Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures upon that subject, from which I have quoted. We are informed of the competition we are to meet and how we are to meet it. These investigations have been made both in northern and southern China and India and South America. The people of the South who are engaged in producing this great wealth of our country have outstripped our brethren of the North in the manufacture of cotton goods, because, from manufacturing only a small portion thirty years ago, we now manufacture more raw cotton in the South than in the Northern or Eastern States. And for this great staple product of ours, which is turned into cloth for the clothing of the world, we simply ask that the small sum of \$20,000 shall be appropriated in order that we may be informed where this trade can best be found and the conditions existing, so we can compete with the world.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] asked the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS] if there was any proof or any statement that these investigations had been of any benefit. I have in my possession a telegram signed by many manufacturers of cotton-seed oil in my district, and they have appealed to me asking me to see that this appropriation shall be had, because it has been of inestimable benefit to them and to the manufacturers of cotton-seed oil. I make this statement on information furnished by gentlemen who are engaged in the manufacture of at least \$100,000,000 worth of this product a year.

Mr. Chairman, this product, the cotton of the South, not only brings wealth to the South, as it has done, but it has brought wealth to the entire people of the United States. For more than three or four years the value of the product has increased from \$540,000,000 until the product this year will amount to \$650,000,000 and more, not for the manufactured product, but for the raw material. No other product of this country can compare with it except the great corn crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like just a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BART-

LETT] asks unanimous consent to continue his remarks for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I started to say this great crop of ours is greater in value than all of the other crops of the country except corn, and the most remarkable thing is that with that crop, amounting to \$650,000,000 a year, the raw material is not consumed at home like that other great agricultural product which exceeds it in value, but two-thirds of it is shipped and brings into this country every year hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign gold to create and increase our prosperity, not simply of its producers, but of the entire country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and the substitute was rejected.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting foreign commerce of the United States, \$30,000, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the provision I have offered and the provision offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is that, in the first place, it eliminates the specific compensation to be paid to a special agent. I believe the gentleman's provision calls for compensation at the rate of \$10 a day, and, secondly, my substitute omits the words "twenty thousand dollars" as the specified sum to be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products, and, further, I propose to reduce the total amount appropriated from \$50,000 to \$30,000. I am in complete sympathy with the end that is sought to be attained with this appropriation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, why does the gentleman cut out cotton, when he knows—

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will give me but two minutes I will try and explain my position. I want to develop the commerce of the United States in every possible way. I am a manufacturer, even a manufacturer of cotton goods. I have read these reports one after the other, for I have been on the Appropriation Committee which has suggested to the House this legislation from its origin. We submitted it originally through the urgent appeals of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to the effect that if he could but have a sum so as to send agents into one country and another, he could report to Congress facts that would enable our manufacturers to extend their trade in a very large way. The result of that first \$30,000 of expenditure was that a professor of the faculty of the University of California was appointed one of the agents. He visited the countries of South and Central America with two other agents. One of them, I believe, was assistant commissioner at the Paris Exposition, and I believe the other one a newspaper writer, who visited various countries, and sent us back these reports, which gentlemen can obtain and read.

Now, gentlemen, you can not develop the trade of the United States by statistics; you can not develop the trade of the United States by having a newspaper writer send you an attractive description of various conditions of any particular trade in a country, neither can you do it by gathering from guidebooks and trade journals certain peculiarities of trade. If you want to develop the trade of the United States in any particular way, send some competent manufacturer abroad; keep him abroad long enough that he can go into the details of production and distribution that will enable the home manufacturer to understand in detail what he must do to compete with his competitors in that market. I do not believe that the expenditure of the \$80,000 already appropriated will ever bring back \$80,000 to the United States. We are all intensely interested in the cotton industry and hope to see it extended year after year, as it has in the last half dozen years begun to be extended in the South, until it conquers a large part of the trade of manufactured cotton goods throughout the world. But you can not do it in this way; you can not do it by attractive reports of newspaper men sent around the world. Nor can you aid the cotton-seed people to find a market in this way. If the cotton-seed oil industry, trust or otherwise, wants to extend its trade, it has competent men, who thoroughly

understand the details of that business; and if this country does not furnish a large enough market for their oil they will send men throughout the world and use every shrewd business method to extend their trade, and they will get results that will inure to their profit.

Now, the appropriation last year as it passed the House was amended by an addition of \$20,000 to be specially devoted to cotton. I know nothing about whether it has resulted in any good or not. This year we have been appealed to by various manufacturers, by manufacturers of machines and machine tools, by boot and shoe manufacturers, and by many other trades to extend specifically appropriation to cover their particular articles. By the way, there is a report on the boot and shoe trade in England. I do not believe that report is worth—I was going to say 10 cents. I do not believe there is a fact in it—and I personally deal with leather and leather goods, so that I know something about it—that will ever enable an extra pair of shoes to be sent out of the country or keep a man in this country a day longer at work. I believe that this entire appropriation will lead to no good result. There is a great deal of sentiment connected with the question, and a great deal of sentiment connected with the \$20,000 with respect to cotton goods. When the United States will no longer provide the best, most profitable, and most ample market for our manufactures, the energetic, enterprising manufacturers of our country will themselves find the way to extend their trade and conquer the markets of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that he was in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 88, noes 70.

Mr. HEFLIN. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 77.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21574, and had come to no resolution thereon.

STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following House resolution, and I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following House resolution, and also that the report thereon be printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 663.

Resolved That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that hereafter, in printing reports, documents, or other publications authorized by law, ordered by Congress or either branch thereof, or emanating from the Executive Departments, their bureaus or branches, and independent offices of the Government, the Government Printing Office should observe and adhere to the standard of orthography prescribed in generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

The report is as follows:

In reporting favorably the accompanying resolution the Committee on Printing has been governed by the following considerations:

In the various reprints of the Constitution of the United States adherence to the original spelling is found in the majority of instances.

The spelling in the original statutes reflects the forms of spelling in vogue at the time of their enactment.

The various codifications of the statutes reflect the spelling in vogue at the time of the adoption of such codifications.

The last codification adopted was in 1878. The Statutes at Large now number fourteen volumes, covering a period of twenty-eight years. Each volume reflects the spelling in vogue at the time of the enactment of the statutes embraced therein.

A new codification is about to be presented to Congress. Until Congress shall see fit to order the printing of this proposed codification of the statutes, embracing all the enactments of the law-making power of the Government now in force, in some form of spelling other than that generally accepted by the people, it would appear to be the part of wisdom for the Government in all its branches, in the interest of simplicity and economy, to adhere to a uniform system of spelling, and this sys-

tem should be the one already most generally recognized and accepted by the people.

If Congress shall adhere to the form of spelling already in vogue as applied to the statutes, it would appear anomalous to employ some other form as applied to all of the preliminary stages of legislation, including the proceedings of Congress, up to the point where these proceedings are crystallized into law, and at this point order a change in the spelling of the perfected legislation to preserve harmony in the orthography of the national statutes.

The Executive order under which many public documents have already been printed was issued on the 27th day of August, 1906, and has now been in force for more than three months. It has been extensively exploited, and the public has had ample opportunity to digest the arguments presented in its favor.

Without taking issue as to the relative merits of any form of spelling, it is evident that public sentiment as reflected in the newspapers, magazines, and other publications has not been favorable to the proposed innovation embraced in the Executive order of August 27.

It is, therefore, a condition and not a theory with which Congress has to deal. It is not believed that the attitude of the general public would be materially changed if the Government in all its branches were to adopt the form of spelling prescribed in the Executive order referred to, and only confusion and expense would result without any commensurate advantage, even if the new form of spelling were deemed preferable. Moreover, Congress has no assurance, even if it should leave present conditions undisturbed, that the next succeeding Administration would not revoke the present order. Much of the matter embraced in the publications of the Government is preserved in the form of stereotyped or electrotyped plates, representing enormous values to the Government in the saving of labor and other expense. All of these plates would be rendered worthless in a moment by an order in a succeeding Administration revoking the Executive order of August 27 last.

The sentiment in Congress is such that it must be taken without question that in the printing done for Congress the standard dictionaries will continue to be the accepted authority. If some other form of spelling is to apply to the Executive Departments, it means a dual form of spelling in the Government printing.

Much of the printing that is done for Congress is reproduced in executive documents. Much of the printing that is done for the Executive Departments is reproduced in Congressional publications. If the Government is to have two forms of spelling, this will necessarily mean double composition, double stereotyping and electrotyping, double proof reading, and other incidental expense. It will mean a double force of proof readers, for it is inconceivable that a proof reader could be required to adapt himself to more than one system of spelling with the expectation of rendering efficient service.

In justice to Government officials, it may be said, an order which dictates a particular form of orthography, involving a departure from the recognized standard in popular use, imposes upon the head of an Executive Department, as well as upon all of his subordinates, a policy that may well be considered in many instances offensive.

In the opinion of the committee, any departure from the recognized standards of orthography can not with safety, satisfaction, or economy be taken until Congress and the Executive shall agree upon the adoption of other orthographic methods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield to me a minute?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. I want to say one word, because if this resolution goes through by unanimous consent without explanation it might look as if everybody who believed in the simplified spelling had changed his mind overnight. While I am perfectly content with this resolution, it is not because I have in the slightest changed my opinion; but I recognized yesterday that this House prefers the spelling now approved by the standard dictionaries. I believe it is very proper and economical that all Government documents should follow the same system of spelling. I do not believe some of us should have our speeches printed in one system and others in another, or that the Executive documents should be printed in one form and the documents of the House of Representatives in another. I should prefer that all documents should be printed with the new spelling, but inasmuch as they should all be uniform, and I am obviously in the minority, I bow to the will of the majority and approve the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I referred to the origin of the law identifying or pointing out the English language as the language of England, from which, as I claim, we inherit the language that we have in this country.

I now ask unanimous consent to extend these remarks in the RECORD, to the extent of publishing the law under which the official language of the people of England was changed from the Norman-French to the English of to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The statute in question was passed in 1362, in the reign of King Edward III, and is as follows:

CAP. XV.—Pleas shall be pleaded in the English tongue, and inrolled in Latin.

Item, because it is often showed to the King by the prelates, dukes, earls, barons, and all the commonalty of the great mischiefs which have happened to divers of the realm, because the laws, customs, and statutes of this realm be not commonly holden and kept in the same realm, for that they be pleaded, shewed, and judged in the French tongue, which is much unknown in the said realm, so that the people which do implead, or be impleaded, in the King's court, and in the courts of other, have no knowledge nor understanding of that which is said for them or against them by their serjeants and other pleaders; (2) and that

reasonably the said laws and customs the rather shall be perceived and known, and better understood in the tongue used in the said realm, and by so much every man of the said realm may the better govern himself without offending of the law, and the better keep, save, and defend his heritage and possessions; (3) and in divers regions and countries, where the King, the nobles, and other of the said realm have been, good governance and full right is done to every person, because that their laws and customs be learned and used in the tongue of the country; (4) the King, desiring the good governance and tranquillity of his people, and to put out and eschew the harms and mischiefs which do or may happen in this behalf by the occasions aforesaid, hath ordained and established by the assent aforesaid, that all pleas which shall be pleaded in any courts whatsoever, before any of his justices whatsoever, or in his other places, or before any of his other ministers whatsoever, or in the courts and places of any other lords whatsoever within the realm, shall be pleaded, shewed, defended, answered, debated, and judged in the English tongue and that they be entered and enrolled in Latin; (5) and that the laws and customs of the same realm, terms, and processes, be holden and kept as they be and have been before this time; (6) and that by the ancient terms and forms of the declarations no man be prejudiced, so that the matter of the action be fully shewed in the declaration and in the writ. (7) And it is accorded by the assent aforesaid that this ordinance and statute of pleading begin and hold place at the fifteenth of St. Hillary next coming.

Thus it will be seen that the English language became ours first, by the statute itself here cited, and second, by our inheritance. While it may be true that we do not in terms in the United States adopt the common law of England in all our matters of legislation, it is equally true that the pioneers who came to Jamestown believed that they brought with them the common law of England as their guide, and for all these years since the reign of Edward III, more than five hundred years, the English language as specified in the dictionaries of the language has been the true language of the English speaking people. It would seem, therefore, that the standards which have built up the language are the proper guides to the present condition, and that the changes must come more gradually, as they have been coming, and which will no doubt in the long run continue to modify the orthography of the language to a full and satisfactory result.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire the privilege of extending my remarks on the amendment to the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the same request. Is there objection to either request?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I also make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS] also makes the same request. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 6855. An act to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RESIGNATION OF REPRESENTATIVE PATTERSON, OF TENNESSEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1906.

To the SPEAKER:

I herewith tender my resignation as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to take effect on the 15th day of January, 1907.

I have the honor to inclose a copy of a letter addressed to the Hon. John I. Cox, governor of Tennessee, notifying him of my said resignation.

I have the honor to be, respectfully,

M. R. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Tenth District Tennessee.

DECEMBER 13, 1906.

His Excellency JOHN I. COX,
Governor of Tennessee.

SIR: I have the honor to notify you that I have this day tendered my resignation as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, said resignation to take effect January 15, 1907.

A copy of said resignation is herein inclosed.

I have the honor to be, respectfully,

M. R. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Tenth District Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, this communication will lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature in reference to sale of coal and asphalt lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for dredging and piers at Jamestown Exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, requesting attention to the accumulation of useless papers in his Department—to the Joint Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, submitting an estimate of appropriation for a site for a house and an outbuilding at Duluth (Minn.) range light station—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriations for rent of additional quarters for the Auditor for the Navy Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation to regulate the compensation of the superintendent of the national cemetery at Arlington—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a detailed statement of the expenses of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of urgent appropriation for pay of the Military Academy—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of the International Water Boundary Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of hearings on land entries and of depositing public moneys—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a report of disbursements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in the several States and Territories—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a copy of a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature relative to public highways in the nation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature protesting against the enrollment of certain children, and transmitting an opinion of the Assistant Attorney-General in the case of Ethel Pierson—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting papers relating to the claim of Gutierrez Hermanos—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in accordance with the act of June 29, 1906, certain documents pertaining to the construction of a new vessel for the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for contingent expenses of the Territorial legislature of New Mexico—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9250) granting an increase of pension to Obediah B. Nation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5423); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14862) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. White, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5424); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16249) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5425); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16389) granting a pension to Jefferson Wilcox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5426); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16488) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hopkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5427); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16546) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Beeler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5428); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18608) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Strickland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5429); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18677) granting a pension to Martin A. Luther, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5430); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18758) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Daniel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5431); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18791) granting a pension to Michael Bocosey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5432); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19363) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Bland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5433); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19510) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. West, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5434); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19577) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Patton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5435); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19579) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mayfield, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5436); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19648) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5437); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19713) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Mason, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5438); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19715) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Brunson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5439); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19716) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5440); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19722) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burns, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5441); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19818) granting an increase of pension to William F. Clinkscales, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5442); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19907) granting an increase of pension to James Butler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5443); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19923) granting an increase of pension to Bettie Ferguson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5444); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19998) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Cook, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5445); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20087) granting an increase of pension to Cassia C. Tyler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5446); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20088) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Thurmond, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5447); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20146) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Kenney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5448); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20166) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Salmon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5449); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20198) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Maddox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5450); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20219) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Downing, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5451); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20250) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McBride, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5452); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20269) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Galloway, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5453); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20357) granting an increase of pension to Jane Aldridge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5454); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20363) granting an increase of pension to Otis E. Rnsh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5455); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20391) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Meldrim, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5456); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20424) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wheeler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5457); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21142) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rose, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5458); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21216) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. McCardel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5459); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21578) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Gashey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5460); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7211) granting a pension to James C. Southerland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5461); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18582) granting a pension to Josephine Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5462); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 22332) to construct a canal from Rio Grande to Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 22333) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bradford, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 22334) to amend an act to regulate the sitting of the United States courts within the district of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 22335) to amend section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 22336) for the better protection of depositors and creditors of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 22337) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 22338) to bridge Bayou Bartholomew, in Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22339) appropriating \$250,000 to eradicate the Texas fever tick—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 22340) to provide for a survey of Sabine River, in Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 22341) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 22342) for the erection of a public building at Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 22343) to provide for the erection of a District of Columbia building and an appropriate exhibit therein at the Jamestown Ter-Centennial Exposition, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 22344) to provide for the erection of a public building at Hickory, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Gastonia, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 22346) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell the lands in Mays Gulf of Little River, Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 22347) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, approved April 26, 1906"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 22348) authorizing a public building at Monroe, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 22349) to increase the amount fixed as the limit of cost of site and building at Murfreesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 22350) to authorize the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia to recopy old records in his office, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 22351) to survey and allot the lands embraced within the limits of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and to open the surplus lands to settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 22352) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act approved May 9, 1900, in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 22353) establishing a minimum rate of pensions for soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 22354) to provide for the improvement of Broad Creek River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIVES: A bill (H. R. 22355) to provide for the erection of a public building at Litchfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22356) to remove restrictions on the sale of certain lands in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) disapproving certain laws enacted by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAYES: A resolution (H. Res. 660) requesting certain information of the Secretary of War concerning the Chinese and Japanese coolies now employed on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 661) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills to appoint an additional clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 662) concerning the pay of employees of the folding room—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 22357) granting an increase of pension to Silas Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22358) granting an increase of pension to Oliver D. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 22359) grant-

ing an increase of pension to Louisa L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 22360) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 22361) granting an increase of pension to George W. Favorite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 22362) making an appropriation to pay Esther Rousseau for horses killed upon the Cheyenne Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22363) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred L. Dutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 22364) granting a pension to James F. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22365) granting a pension to Charles B. Fessenden, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22366) for the relief of Adam R. Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22367) for the relief of Patrick Conlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22368) for the relief of Alonzo Rich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22369) for the relief of James B. Callison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22370) for the relief of Daniel Sands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 22371) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 22372) granting an increase of pension to James C. Corder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22373) granting an increase of pension to Willis Hargrave—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22374) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Elam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22375) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Halcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 22376) granting a pension to William M. Colby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22377) granting a pension to Robert R. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 22378) granting an increase of pension to Lidia A. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 22379) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 22380) granting a pension to Sylvester S. Ingals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22381) granting a pension to William H. Belknap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22382) granting a pension to Josie I. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22383) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22384) granting an increase of pension to William S. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22385) granting an increase of pension to James S. Brackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22386) granting an increase of pension to William H. Tripp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22387) granting an increase of pension to William Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22388) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Peabody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22389) granting an increase of pension to Harriett M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22390) granting an increase of pension to Helen R. Worcester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22391) granting an increase of pension to David Y. Kenion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22392) granting an increase of pension to Eugene W. Rolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22393) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 22394) granting an increase of pension to M. V. Easterday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22395) granting a pension to Edward Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 22396) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alyea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22397) granting an increase of pension to Francis B. C. Rall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22398) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Forry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22399) granting an increase of pension to William Sauvain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22400) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 22401) to provide compensation to Daniel Yancey for buildings constructed by him in the Yellowstone National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 22402) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred Childers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 22403) granting a pension to Pleasant H. Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22404) granting a pension to William Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22405) granting an increase of pension to Horatio M. McGoughy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 22406) granting an increase of pension to Ignatious Lentenbacher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22407) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peacock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 22408) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 22409) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. McAdoo—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 22410) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22411) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Yeakey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 22412) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Hubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22413) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel S. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 22414) granting an increase of pension to Buckhardt Schoenstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22415) granting an increase of pension to T. W. David—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 22416) granting an increase of pension to Barbara E. Schwab—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 22417) granting an increase of pension to David B. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 22418) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 22419) granting a pension to Elizur F. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 22420) granting an increase of pension to Edward Wesley Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 22421) granting an increase of pension to D. H. Moredick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 22422) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22423) granting an increase of pension to Louis Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 22424) granting an increase of pension to William Faulkner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 22425) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sires—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 22426) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 22427) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Braman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22428) granting a pension to Dora T. Bristol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22429) granting a pension to George R. Woodruff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 22430) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 22431) granting an increase of pension to Alden Youngman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 22432) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Matteson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 22433) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 22434) granting an increase of pension to Peter McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22435) granting an increase of pension to Knud R. Syverald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 22436) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22437) granting an increase of pension to Louis A. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22438) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 22439) granting an increase of pension to Martin N. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 22440) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Mose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22441) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 22442) granting an increase of pension to John Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 22443) granting an increase of pension to Lyman S. Strickland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 22444) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 22445) granting a pension to Adaline T. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22446) granting a pension to William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22447) granting an increase of pension to Frank Schadler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 22448) granting a pension to F. Medora Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 22449) granting a pension to Charles L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22450) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 22451) granting an increase of pension to John McCaslin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22452) granting an increase of pension to William A. Narrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 22453) granting an increase of pension to William Swendeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22454) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Darst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22455) granting a pension to Louisa Filley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 22456) granting a pension to Ella Fall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 22457) granting an increase of pension to Julia Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22458) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 22459) granting an increase of pension to James Tetlow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22460) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22461) granting a pension to George A. De Voe—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 22462) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 22463) granting a pension to Virgil H. Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22464) granting a pension to Berthina Cold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22465) granting an increase of pension to George Hoffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22466) granting an increase of pension to Walter Florida—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 22467) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 22468) granting an increase of pension to William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22469) granting an increase of pension to William S. Mooney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 22470) granting an increase of pension to Flavius J. Ruley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14998) for the relief of John Shuffelbarger—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 21701) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 22073) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Scott—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22084) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Jenkins—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22095) granting an increase of pension to William C. Montgomery—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lodge No. 178 of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers of America and other labor organizations, favoring the Merchant Marine Commission shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of Greenwood Council, No. 19, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza O. Calvard—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of C. Tussing, of Tonawanda, N. Y., against section 1, subsection 9, of the copyright bill, relative to the feature against mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John Hand, Isaac N. Bliss, and William J. Turpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Spanish-American Memorial Association, for an appropriation to erect at Washington, D. C., an appropriate memorial of the Spanish war—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of national committee of the Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of the Army canteen at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of Macon Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William O. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin James—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Louisa L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Resolutions of sundry labor organizations, favoring postal savings banks, as follows: Kalamazoo (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 208; Muskegon (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 24; Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 19; Detroit (Mich.) Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers; Biddeford (Me.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 40; Paterson (N. J.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 3; Binghamton (N. Y.) Cigar Makers' Unions, Nos. 218 and 16; New York City Cigar Makers' Union, No. 141; Gloversville (N. Y.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 483; Philadelphia (Pa.) Bakers' Local Union No. 6; Davenport (Iowa) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 172; Muscatine (Iowa) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 120; Marysville (Kans.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 163; Louisville (Ky.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 32; St. Louis (Mo.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 44; Minneapolis (Minn.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 77; Memphis (Tenn.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 266; Norfolk (Va.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 240; Aberdeen (Wash.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 109; Canton (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 297; Elgin (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 71; Monmouth (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 305; Peoria (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 118; Cincinnati (Ohio) Steam Fitters and Helpers' Union, No. 53; Cincinnati (Ohio) Central Labor Council; Cincinnati (Ohio) Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, No. 15; Cincinnati (Ohio) Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, No. 222; Canton (Ohio) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 115; Columbus (Ohio) Protective Union, No. 75; Springfield (Ohio) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 45; Eau Claire (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 85; Manitowoc (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 477; Milwaukee (Wis.) Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, No. 15; Watertown (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 381; also the following, all of Chicago: Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Union; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, No. 260; Amalgamated Glassworkers' International Association, Local No. 1; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 5; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 7; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 44; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 75; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 17; Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, No. 266; Horse Nail Makers' Union No. 7180; International Association of Bridge and Structural Ironworkers, No. 1; International Association of Machinists, Progressive Lodge, No. 126; International Association of Machinists, Tool and Die Makers, Lodge No. 510; International Association of Machinists, Unity Lodge, No. 134; International Association of Machinists, Reliable Lodge, No. 253; International Association of Machinists, Brassworkers' Lodge, No. 766; International Association of Steam, Hot Water, and Power Pipe Fitters, No. 54; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, No. 324; International Union of Steam Engineers, No. 115; Independent Wood Carvers' Association of North America; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, No. 12; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, No. 721; International Longshoremen, Marine and Transportation Workers, No. 361; International Union of Elevator Constructors, No. 2; Journeymen Horseshoers' Local Union No. 4; Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 5; Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Platers' Union No. 6; Lithographers' International Protective and Benevolent Association, Local Union No. 70; National Stonecutters' Society of the United States; Plasterers' Local Union No. 5; Plumbers' Union No. 189; Photo-Engravers' Union No. 5; Sprinkler Fitters' Union No. 281; Shipwrights, Joiners, and Caulkers' International Union, No. 17; Switchmen's Union, Chicago Lodge, No. 199; Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, No. 115; Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Union; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, No. 260; Amalgamated Glassworkers' International Association, Local No. 1; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 5; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 7; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 44; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 75; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 17; Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, Division No. 266; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union No. 62; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 1; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 141; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 181; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Chicago Division, No. 96; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Mount Pleasant Division, No. 429; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, John Player Division, No. 458; Butchers and Grocery Clerks' Association, No. 3; Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders and Helpers, No. 39; Brotherhood of Engravers,

No. 1; Chicago Trades Union Label League; Cigar Packers' International Union, Local No. 227; Coopers' International Union, No. 1; Carriage and Cab Drivers' Union No. 17; Elevated Railway Employees' Union, Division No. 308; Glove Workers' Union, No. 18—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Patrick Conlin, James F. Humphries, and Charles B. Fessenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Alonzo Rich and Daniel Sands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Adam R. Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of the Newburgh News Publishing Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of Hazel Glen Council, No. 208, and Laurel Council, No. 126, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Union No. 299, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, of Davenport, Iowa, for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Will P. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of Central City Council, No. 52, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred Childress—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Lincoln Council, No. 14, and McKinley Council, No. 81, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of Coopers' Machine Operators, No. 75, of Minneapolis, Minn., for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Arkansas, for an appropriation to make the waters of White River available for electric-power purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Pearson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Petition of Saginaw Reading Club, for free-art legislation, as per bill H. R. 15268—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Margaret A. McAdoo—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petitions of Bethlehem Council, No. 79, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Queen City Council, and Victory Council, No. 180, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Phoenix Council, No. 58, and Concord Council, No. 134, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403) to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Vesuvius Council, No. 116, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sharpsburg, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of William W. Tyson and Edward Hadfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Lady Unity Council, No. 51, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Pride of Bridgeport Council, No. 3, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Petitions of Old Glory Council, No. 18, Daughters of America, of Terre Haute, Ind., and Lipord Council, No. 70, and Lincoln Council, No. 56, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUFF: Petitions of Bolivar Council, No. 570, and Paintersville Council, No. 211, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Stanton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: Paper to accompany bill

for relief of Charles E. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolutions of Pomona Grange, Jefferson County, N. Y., for reduction of duties on Philippine products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of the Fruit Growers' Association of Adams County, Pa., for legislation to secure admission of American fruit to German markets at minimum duties—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Federation of Trades Unions of York, Pa., for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Rickrods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ella K. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie K. Slothower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Louis N. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of the Telegram, Holyoke, Mass., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE: Petition of Mary E. Rainey, heir of Thomas R. Couche, deceased, praying for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin W. Brayman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dora T. Bristol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William Marvin et al., for an appropriation to open, widen, and deepen the channel of Eightmile River, in Lyme, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary S. Houghtaling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of the Business Men's Association and the city council of Rock Island, Ill., for an appropriation to improve the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew J. Moore, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petitions of Annville Council, No. 954; Swatara (Middletown, Pa.) Council, No. 858, and Steelton Council, No. 162, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Silver Star Council (Harrisburg, Pa.), No. 130, and Lincoln Council (Carlisle, Pa.), No. 117, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Milwaukee Division, No. 46, Railway Conductors of America, for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Aurela Robillard, and of H. P. Morancy, administrator of estate of Zachary White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Philip Houser and heirs of Daniel Ruggles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Schadler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Cattle Raisers' Association, praying Congress to require the railways to furnish sufficient cars to ship live stock to market—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac L. Stine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of John S. Bray, Joseph W. King, James D. Cox, and Richard H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Maria Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of J. H. Parkhurst et al., for an appropriation to reimburse said petitioners for over daily hours of work on Georgetown pumping station from May 1, 1871, to December, 1890—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Lansdale Council, No. 111,

Daughters of Liberty, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Mary C. Jones, Mary Ann Cody, Margaret L. James, Susan Baker, Mary Levina Williams, and Isabel Manney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of the Somerset (N. J.) Democrat, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 14, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SPERRY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of William C. Manning (H. R. 1857, Fifty-eighth Congress), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PENSION DAY.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HERBURN in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 2. The pay of telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen provided for in this act, except those employed in mints and assay offices, unless otherwise specially stated, shall be as follows: For telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, and watchmen, at the rate of \$720 per annum each; for laborers, at the rate of \$660 per annum each; assistant telephone switchboard operators, at the rate of \$600 each, and for charwomen, at the rate of \$240 per annum each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to section 2 in order to make an inquiry. Does this section increase or decrease the compensation of these employees, or simply classify them?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not in any way increase or decrease the compensation, but it is for the purpose of preventing the continual repetition throughout the bill.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, or office shall be transferred on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order upon this section.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to that section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order until an explanation can be made.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of the appropriation bill the fact appeared that there is in every Department of the Government and in some of the bureaus of some of the Departments miscellaneous libraries, libraries of fiction